P

THE SOUTHERN

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 29 1967
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XIV.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.
1862.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIV.

NUMBER I.

Article	Page
I.—The Princeton Review on the State of the Country. By Rev. John H. Rice, D. D., Louisville, Ky.,	1
II.—Coleridge. By Rev. Enoch Pond, D. D., Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.,	44
III.—Female Education. By Prof. Joseph LeConte, M. D., South Carolina College,	60
IV.—The Trinity of the Godhead the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. By Rev. Thos. Smyth, D. D., Charleston, S. C.,	92
V.—Bunsen on the Bible. By Rev. Geo. Howe, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.,	96
VI.—A Vindication of Secession and the South. By Rev. Benjamin M. Palmer, D. D., New Orleans, La.,	134
VII.—Periodical Literature,	178

NUMBER II.

I.—The School, the College, and the University, in relation to one another and to Active Life. By Professor Joseph LeConte, M. D., South Carolina College,	185

ARTICLE PAGE

II.—THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES. By Rev. THOS. SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - - - - 227

III.—GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE. Anonymous, - - 246

IV.—PULPIT ORATORY. By a Georgia Pastor, - - - 275

V.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861. By Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - - - - - - - 296

VI.—NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, - - - 349

VII.—PERIODICAL LITERATURE, - - - - - 361

NUMBER III.

I.—THE BATTLE OF FORT SUMTER: ITS MYSTERY AND MIRACLE—GOD'S MASTERY AND MERCY. By Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - 365

II.—THE WALDENSES AND INFANT BAPTISM. Ry Rev. J. L. KIRKPATRICK, D. D., Davidson College, N. C., 399

III.—PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT. By Rev. J. B. HILLHOUSE, Laurens District, S. C., - - 431

IV.—ANALOGY BETWEEN THE FORMATION OF THE PIHEL CONJUGATION IN HEBREW AND THE PERFECT TENSE IN LATIN. By Prof. E. L. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C., - - - - - 444

V.—THE PERSONALITY OF GOD, AS AFFECTING SCIENCE AND RELIGION. Anonymous, - - - - 450

VI.—THE SCOTCH-IRISH, AND THEIR FIRST SETTLEMENTS ON TYGER RIVER AND OTHER NEIGHBORING PRECINCTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA. By Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., 472

VII.—EXPLANATORY NOTE. By Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - 502

NUMBER IV.

ARTICLE PAGE

I.—INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF REV. JAMES WOODROW, Ph. D., Perkins Professor Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - - - - 505

II.—ADDRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA TO ALL THE CHURCHES OF JESUS CHRIST THROUGHOUT THE EARTH, - - - - - - - - 531

III.—THE ART OF CONVERSATION. By Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - - 550

IV.—TIMOTHY'S OFFICE. By Rev. THOMAS V. MOORE, D. D., Richmond, Va., - - - - - 569

V.—THE VICTORY OF MANASSAS PLAINS. By Rev. THOS. SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - 593

VI.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT AUGUSTA. By Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - 618

P

T

P
f
o
t
i
o
t
S
y
(
c
s
l

t
a
p

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XIV.—NO. 1.

APRIL, MDCCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.*

The appearance of the above named article in the Princeton Review, for January, 1861, has excited the profoundest emotions of astonishment and grief in the minds of all in the South, and many at the North, who care for the interests of our beloved Church. The standing and influence of the Biblical Repertory, as well as the character of the article itself, require us to give it our special attention. The chief end that we propose is the vindication of Southern Christians from the, no doubt honestly mistaken, yet most amazing misrepresentations of the writer. Many God-fearing men have gone heart and hand with the political movements of the Southern States, and we desire to show that in so doing they have not proved themselves to be either mad men or dishonest demagogues.

* This article comes to us from a much respected correspondent in one of the border Southern States, and we very willingly admit it to our pages, although, of course, it does not look at the subject from exactly the same point of view occupied by ourselves in these Confederate States.—Eds. So. Pres. Rev.

Great and radical changes in the social or political institutions of a people are always the result of corresponding changes in public opinion; "and no revolution in public opinion is the work of an individual, of a single cause, or of a day. When the crisis has arrived, the catastrophe must ensue; but the agents through whom it is apparently accomplished, though they may accelerate, can not originate its occurrence."* There are points in the downward progress of men and nations from which they may retrace their steps. There are also points from which there is no return. There is an unseen line crossing every path, whether of individuals or communities, beyond which, if they go, they are lost. It is, however, contrary to all the facts of history, as well as subversive of the whole science of human life and conduct, to attribute the whole power decisive of the destinies of nations to the happenings of one brief hour. To the recluse, unobservant of the mighty sweep of events through years and centuries, or unaware of their true significance, it may seem very natural to refer the final catastrophe to its immediate antecedents of a few days, or even of an hour; but he who would truly estimate the forces which overthrow the loftiest structures ever reared by human genius and human might, must trace the streams back to their fountains, in distant years, and perhaps in the far past ages. This would be a trivial error, were it not for its influence upon all the efforts made to avert disaster, and upon the judgments of men as to the parties who must bear the responsibility of its occurrence. The article under review affords a very striking instance of the evil influence of this error in both particulars.

Another error, at the very outset, has led the writer into still greater mistakes. He says: "There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought,

* Sir W. Hamilton.

not in considerations of State policy, but in the law of God. On such occasions, the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated." But the distinction between things religious and things secular exists in the very nature of each, and can, therefore, never be obliterated, nor even forgotten, without injury. The rule of political action is always to be sought in the will of God, and sound reasons of State policy must uniformly be coincident with that will. There is an Atheistic politics. There is, also, a Deistic, as well as a Theistic, politics. The Theistic is the only true political science, because it alone corresponds with existing realities. It does not admit of the total forgetfulness of God at all ordinary times; but, on great occasions, the removal of political questions from their own proper domain to the more elevated sphere of religion. Occasions never do, and never can occur, where political questions rise into the sphere of religion. They always belong to the sphere of ethics.

This very confounding of religion with politics has been the most fruitful source of the evils which have overtaken the nation. It has not been, however, the elevation of politics, but the degradation of religion; and this has uniformly been the result of every attempt to combine the two into one system. Politics and religion move in different orbits. Each has its own definite relation to a common centre. They deal with the same men, and often with the same subject matter, but upon principles and for ends wholly diverse. They can never come into collision without mutual injury. Like two planets, they exert upon each other a beneficial influence, while each fills its own peculiar sphere; and this is not an occasional, but a constant power. It might just as well be said that there are occasions where the harmony and well being of the physical universe require that the Earth should rise to the orbit of Jupiter or Saturn. Nothing but the crush of worlds and dire confusion could result from such a disturbance of the order of

nature. And a like catastrophe has always followed a similar derangement of the relations between politics and religion. Would that the Princeton Review had treated the state of the country from a religious stand-point. There the well known piety of the Editor, and his acknowledged ability as a theologian, might have done most efficient service in calming the minds of the people wherever his wide spread influence extends. He might have done much to restore harmony to our greatly distracted country, or, at least, to avert the civil war which he deprecates as earnestly as we do. At the very worst, he might have done much to preserve the unity and harmony of our beloved Church. This part was not chosen, and the political article now under consideration could hardly fail, as the event has proved, to stimulate passions already too much excited, and to exasperate still more the animosity which has long been growing between two sections of the country.

We are, therefore, constrained to treat this article, in accordance with its real nature, as a discussion of the political questions which now so deeply agitate all parts of this great continent. We repeat, that our main design is to prove that Christian men at the South have not been given up to delusion, nor are they destitute of virtue.

When we think of the Union of the States of North America as it was constituted by our fathers, we can go as far as the farthest in extolling the grand conception. Many stirring and many gentle thoughts cluster around our memories of the olden time, when, shoulder to shoulder, the men of the Northern and Southern colonies fought to achieve their independence as sovereign States. Imperfect as the Union has always been, under it our people have accomplished great and glorious things; and but for the black spirit of discord, which some thirty years ago began its destructive work, it might have realized the wildest dreams of the fathers, or the brightest hopes of the men of later generations. We feel the full force of all the tender

associations connected with our common kindred and common Christianity; and for these, and many other reasons, we do not undertake to estimate the value of the Union in dollars and cents, any more than we would to estimate "the value of a father's blessing or a mother's love." It must be remembered, however, that great questions of political freedom are sometimes necessarily brought to a pecuniary test, as was certainly the case in our contest with the mother country, which resulted in the independence of these States. There is, moreover, a still higher example. Our Lord Himself refers the paramount concerns of religion and the life eternal to the same standard: "One thing thou lackest," etc.—(Mark 10: 21.) It would not be difficult, therefore, to answer the reproach, even though considerations of dollars and cents were as prominent as they are in fact insignificant, amid the causes which have dismembered this nation. We understand fully the reasons for Union, arising out of the geographical relations of the various sections of this vast country. The courses of its rivers, the direction of the mountain ranges and valleys, as well as the artificial means of intercommunication, all indicate that the States of North America should live together in harmony and the interchange of mutual benefits, if not absolutely under the same political Constitution. But human interests and human passions are greater powers than geographical boundaries. Persistent fanatical hate can raise higher barriers between two peoples, than the Andes on the summits of the Himalayas.

We do not intend to follow the reviewer through his exhibition, in contrast of the reasons which, he says, the politicians have assigned as producing the present state of things. It is not difficult to see which set of opinions meets with the hearty concurrence of the writer. We shall simply content ourselves with saying that we have not so read the history of the country, and especially of the Territory of Kansas. We do not believe that the Republican

party had its origin in the outrages perpetrated in the settlement of that Territory, as he says, by the South, and as we say, by the North. That party which has destroyed our Union has an older date, and a more enduring foundation, than the transient disturbances in Kansas.

We come now to the questions which he rightly regards as of paramount importance.

"What are the grounds on which the cotton-growing States advocate the dissolution of the Union? or what are the reasons why they desire to secede?"

These questions are propounded as though they were identical. They are, however, very different, and we shall, therefore, give them separate answers. To the first, we say, that neither the cotton-growing States, nor any others of the slaveholding States, nor any considerable number of the prominent citizens of either of them, have ever advocated the dissolution of the Union in any such sense as that contemplated by this question. The secession of the Southern States is not the expression of a wish. It is simply the declaration of a fact. It does not mean that they desired the dissolution of the Union. It only shows that, in their deliberate judgment, the Union has been dissolved, not by them, but by the so-called Republican party of the North. Many of the leaders of the secession movement have loved the Union as their own lives. Truer patriots never governed the counsels of any people. If the sacrifice could avail any thing, they would gladly have emulated the conduct of the noble Roman youth, who, clothed in his richest armor, and decked with his most precious jewels, leaped into the yawning gulf of the Forum. Some of these long ago abandoned the hope of preserving the Union against the growing power by which it has at last been destroyed. But a vast multitude of them continued to hope against hope, until the fatal blow was struck. It is well that the Princeton writer did not strike out the comparison between the disunionist and Benedict Arnold, as certain pencil marks

in the pamphlet edition indicated his intention of doing. No Southern man need be offended. Let the guilt of the disunionist be what it may, the South disclaims the responsibility. It is true that some of the political economists of the South have thought, for a long time, that the material interests of their section would be greatly enhanced by separating from the North and forming a Southern Confederacy. They have believed, very sincerely, that they were impoverished by their connection with the Northern States; but these have never been the opinions of a great majority, and they have had but little to do with the secession of the Southern States. The South has always resisted partial sectional legislation, designed to make her tributary to the North, as South Carolina did in 1832, when she constrained, not from the fears, but from the justice of the whole nation, a compromise of the tariff question. But if the whole South had been, as one man, fully persuaded that their continuance in the Federal Union would deprive her of uncounted thousands of dollars, they would never have dissolved the Union so long as the injury was wrought under the operation of the great laws of political economy, without the unwarrantable interference of partial legislation. They are a people who "swear to their own hurt, and change not." They would, therefore, have continued to bear the burden which was laid upon their shoulders, not by the tyranny of men, but by the stable laws of a great natural economy. The insinuation, or rather the bold assertion, therefore, of the Princeton Review, that the leaders of the Southern movement are actuated only by the sordid love of gain, and that they have taken advantage of the excitement of the people on another and very different subject, to precipitate them into unjustifiable revolution for their supposed advantage, can only be excused on the ground of profound ignorance of the whole subject of Southern principles, Southern interests, and Southern men. The arguments of Southern states-

men, to which he refers, have never been intended to stimulate the people, and to furnish the motive, to secession. They were designed to encourage the timid to stand for their rights, by assuring them that they would not be utterly ruined, but might even enjoy greater prosperity out of the Union than they ever had while in it. They were given in answer to such fearful predictions as those of the Princeton Review, and to the taunts of the North, when they say, "You had better submit to our rule. We do not intend to make it very oppressive. We will impose the yoke upon you very gradually, and it shall not gall very severely; but if you resist us, and prove stubborn and rebellious, it shall go hard with you. We will whip you back to the yoke. We will subdue you by force, as we do our unruly cattle; but even though you should succeed in breaking away from us, and we should leave you to roam wildly in untamed freedom, you will find no fat pastures—you will surely starve to death." In reply to all such predictions, or threats of evil, the Southern statesman demonstrates that the threat to employ force is nugatory. The South can not be subdued by arms, and her material wealth may even be greater than ever it was before. The South does not look upon disunion as the precursor of inevitable and total ruin; but, even though all the prophecies and threats of ruin should be fulfilled to the very letter, she says, "Let come what God may send of evil." She will never submit to the rule of a dominant section of the country, North, East or West, no matter how mildly they may promise to exercise their despotism.

Whatever benefits are to follow disunion, it is said, are to accrue only to the slaveholders—a small minority of the Southern people, not more than three or four hundred thousand of the whole population. The secession movement is, therefore, characterized as invidious, class legislation. All this sounds as if the writer in the Princeton Review had read the celebrated "Helper's Impending Crisis."

We can only say that, if any man who reads that book gives it one particle of his faith—if he does not reject it at once, as false in its statements, false in its arguments and inferences, fiendish in its spirit and in its design—he is himself beyond the reach of argument, and impervious to the force of truth and evidence on the whole subject of which it treats. There is no greater folly than this talk of class legislation for the small minority of slaveholders. The institution of slavery is so interwoven, yea, entwined, with the very texture of the social, political and religious life of the Southern people, that there is no diversity of interest among them. Whether they be rich or poor, white or black, bond or free, their interests are one. The non-slaveholders of the South, agriculturists, mechanics, merchants or professional men, would be the first ruined, and the most completely, by the abolition of slavery; and, for the most part, they have the sense to know it, and to show that they know it by their acts.

Let us proceed to the second question: Why do the cotton-growing States desire to secede? What reasons have induced them to brave all the real difficulties, and all the possible dangers, of secession? Among the reasons assigned by the Princeton writer, only one is true, and that one is stated as it never entered the mind of any Southern man, living or dead, and could not, therefore, be subjectively a motive for their conduct.

The fierce ravings of the Abolitionists have not caused the secession of the Southern States. This has, for many years, been a great annoyance; but it could hardly be called a grievance. The wild outcries of the Abolitionists have excited very various emotions in the breasts of different Southern men. Some have been aroused to anger and scorn; others have been amused; while those who agree, with the Princeton Review, that their language and spirit is execrably wicked, have heard them more in sorrow than in anger. They have felt that the danger to be feared was

for those in whose hearts these fierce fires were burning, and by whose lips such words of blasphemy were uttered. The high-spirited and fiery Southerners, as they are called, have borne for thirty years all that the fanatics could say, and they might very well have endured it a little longer.

The proceedings of the incendiaries sent to the South to entice the slaves to abscond, or to stir them up to revolt and massacre, have not caused the secession of the Southern States. This is undoubtedly a very great grievance, but by no means so formidable as the people of the North generally suppose. It is a great mistake to think that the Southern people feel like "persons who live in a powder magazine, into which others insist upon throwing firebrands." Their great fault is, that they feel entirely too secure. They know that the blacks are a loyal race, and that they are bound to them by ties of interest and affection. In the African, the affections predominate over the intellect more than in any other great division of the human family; yet many of them have intelligence enough to see that the problem of their condition as slaves in this land, so far removed from the native home of their fathers, can not be solved by any scheme of abolition or emancipation, and that it would be very fearfully complicated by discontent or any violent outbreak on their part. Yet even this gentle, loyal people may be made the dupes of crafty villains. Reckless efforts, long continued, may seduce even them from their allegiance to their truest friends. Therefore, this sending of cruel and fiendish emissaries is a grievous wrong; but this, too, has been suffered for years, and the patience of the South might have held out a little longer.

Here let us pause a moment, to ask the solemn question: If the same assaults had been made upon the social system of the North by the pulpit and the press of the South; and if the same efforts had been made, for a period of thirty years, to excite the poor against the rich, to stir up

the laborer against the capitalist, would the labor of the South have proved so utterly fruitless as have been those of the Abolitionists? We think not.

The nullification of the fugitive slave law, and of the constitutional provision upon which it is founded, by the formal legislation of ten States, and the intense anti-slavery sentiment of the whole North, is surely a good ground of complaint, not so much on account of the actual evil which it works, though even in this respect the South are heavy losers, but because of its significance, as showing how majorities can, by law and against law, subvert the Constitution, which is the only defence of minorities against the worst despotism to which man can subject his fellow man. It is only in this aspect of the case that Northern nullification has any direct bearing upon the secession of the South.

The last reason assigned by the Princeton Review as influencing the cotton-growing States to desire to secede, is "the complaint that the South has lost its equality in the Union, or that they are denied equal rights." This complaint is then examined and dismissed as wholly groundless. This is the part of the Princeton Review article which has caused us the greatest sorrow. We have read these four pages but once, and we are thankful that the exigencies of our argument do not require us ever to turn to them again. We do not care to characterize these utterances as they deserve. We need only to quote the sentences that linger sadly in our memory:

"In the past history of the country the South has been dominant. Although in a minority as to population, it has shaped the whole policy of the country."

"This state of things is passing away. By the inevitable progress of events, the sceptre is changing hands."

"Southern statesmen have predicted that the time must come when the South could no longer control the policy of the country."

"Not to command, however, is, in their estimation, to submit. Not to be masters, in the logic of the extremists, is to be slaves."

"The thing complained of is not the irresponsible power of a majority."

These have been selected from four pages of similar assertions, filled with intense, exultant, defiant sectionalism. We do not intend to review the whole history of the United States, to prove that all this is utterly without foundation. The writer admits that it can not possibly be true, in acknowledging that the South has always been in a minority. In what possible way could a minority, however compact, dominate over a majority? We do not, however, intend to follow the Princeton writer through his honest, no doubt, yet total perversions of the plainest facts of history. We shall simply answer assertions by counter assertions, and we do it without fear of successful contradiction. The South never has been dominant in the government of the country. The South, though always in the minority, have never been a compact minority. All the Southern States have never been united in either of the great national parties which have alternately governed the country. Alas! they are not even now agreed as to the time and mode of resisting Northern domination, though they are united as one man as to the necessity of resistance. There never has been a sectional party organized at the South. Up to this very hour it has never been done. The Princeton writer does not hesitate to say that the party which nominated and supported Mr. Breckinridge was a Southern sectional party; yet, in another place, he admits that it would be wrong to affirm this of Mr. Breckinridge, or his party. We affirm that nothing can be further from the truth. The simple fact that John C. Breckinridge, a Union man, from the most Union-loving of all the States, was the candidate, is of itself the complete refutation of the charge. He was nominated as a national man, and, so far as the so-called Southern extremists supported him, it was on their part an effort, however hopeless, in good faith, to save the Union under the Constitution. We say, again, that up to this very hour there has never been a sectional party organized, or attempted to be organized, in the Southern States.

Whatever influence Southern statesmen have had in shaping the policy of the country, has always been the legitimate effect of their genius, talents, or political sagacity, and always in connection with one or the other of the great national parties. We can not, however, pursue this subject. Alas! for the day when the Princeton Review is found joining in such party cries as would never have been uttered by the more high-minded and honorable of the political leaders.

We are now ready to answer the question: Why have the Southern States seceded from the American Union? It may, however, be as well to premise that it is a very great mistake to suppose that the Southern people are a fiery, excitable race—a nation of hotspurs. They may, perhaps, be more excitable by nature than their Northern neighbors, though we have never seen the proof of the fact. We do know that they are ordinarily men of earnest thought and deep convictions. The views which they now take of public affairs have not been suddenly conceived, nor are they lightly held. They have been the slow growth of years. Indeed, the portentous shadows of these times loomed upon the vision of the great prophetic minds of the revolutionary era, and had assumed distinct shape before the minds of men contemporary with the adoption of the Federal Constitution. The present attitude of the South has not been assumed in a fit of transient resentment, nor are they acting under the morbid influence of disappointed ambition. Whether they are in error or not, the men of the South are acting under an awful sense of their responsibility to God and man, as well as the profoundest convictions of right and duty that ever sunk down into the depths of any human soul. But are they in error? Is their whole course a tissue of mistakes and blunders? This brings us back to the question: Why have the Southern States seceded from the Union?

It is because they are fully convinced that they have lost not only equality, but liberty, in the Union. The true cause of Southern discontent is the deep and solemn conviction that, in the Union and under the forms of the Constitution, they are a "conquered people." These are the very words of one of their leading men.

The South maintains that the following is a self-evident proposition, which needs only to be stated to command the assent of every man who knows the meaning of the terms: Make any question whatever a permanent political issue between geographical sections of a great republic, and the union between those sections is *ipso facto* dissolved. If one of the sections is numerically weaker than the other, there remains for it nothing but resistance or vassalage. The only possible hope of the restoration of the Union is in the recession of the dominant majority tendering the issue. The Princeton writer seems to be aware of the influence of geographical considerations upon the political and social interests of men. It is passing strange that he did not see the dissolution of the Union in the very formation of the great sectional party which has at length given its death blow. We assert, with perfect confidence, that the judgment of impartial history will confirm our views, that the separation of the American States was begun when the so-called Republican party was organized as a sectional party, and that it was consummated when that party triumphed over the combined Union men of its own section, in the election of Abraham Lincoln to be President of the United States. The Northern Republicans are the real disunionists. The dissolution of the Federal Union was accomplished by them, and by them alone. They have subverted the Constitution in its most essential principles. The South has only declared that they will never submit to the usurpation.

It is thought to be a perfect answer to all this, to say that the Republican party triumphed under the forms of

the Constitution, and that the election of Mr. Lincoln was strictly legal. What do men care for the casket, after it has been rifled of its priceless jewel? The empty coffer of the Constitution, from which liberty and equality have been extracted, can serve only for the coffin of freedom. What does the fond wife care for the form and features of her husband, if the body, once so dear, has become the possession of a demon, which may, at any moment, use her husband's hands and teeth to tear and rend her? She would feel such keen sorrow as men at the South now feel for the ruin of our Government; but she could not lie down in peace and security by the side of the once loved form, now become the abode of a fierce and malignant spirit. Neither can the South hope for safety under the mere forms of a Constitution, however grand and noble, when a great dominant majority have infused into it the fanatical spirit of Abolitionism, or the more comely, but no less cruel, spirit of sectionalism.

We shall inquire, presently, how far the Republican party is to be regarded as an Abolition or anti-slavery party. Whether it be distinctively such or not, we believe that Abolitionism has mounted it, as the old man of the sea upon the shoulders of Sinbad, and it can not be shaken off. Whether the great dominant majority of the North be abolitionized or not, there can be no question that it is a sectional party, claiming to govern, not only the minority of its own section, by laws operating equally upon themselves and the minority, which is essential to the very idea of free government; but also challenging the right to rule over the whole people of another section of the land, by laws affecting the interests of that section alone, and having no sort of bearing upon the law-makers themselves, except to promote their wealth at the expense of the subject States. In this point of view, it makes no kind of difference on what subject the issue is joined, or whether there is any issue made up between them, other than that of power on the one side,

and subjection on the other. It is, therefore, evident from the very nature of the case, that under the permanent domination of a sectional party, the South are a permanently subdued people. This may be made perfectly clear by an illustration, supposing the subjugation of another section of the Republic. Suppose that an effective majority in all the other States should organize themselves into a great political party, inimical to the manufacturing interests of New England. They obtain possession of the Government of the United States, by regular election, under the prescribed constitutional forms. They soon obtain all the offices of Government—legislative, executive and judicial—and proceed to enact laws forbidding New England mechanics to carry their mills and machinery, or their handicraft tools, to any territory of the United States, or any where beyond the limits of the six States. They then employ all the patronage and power of the Government, under the forms of law, to repress and, finally, to extinguish the manufactories in New England. Suppose that the history of the origin and progress of this party was such as to render it certain that its power would be permanent. What, under such circumstances, would New England do? Would she say: Freedom to move—the very life of the Yankee nation—is lost. The sources of our wealth are dried up. Our country is utterly ruined; but it has all been done under the forms of the Constitution, and we must cheerfully submit; we must give up our manufactures, and turn our industry into other channels? Would the sons of the men who threw the tea into Boston harbor reason thus? Would the children of those whose blood flowed at Lexington and Concord submit to such tyranny? No—they would never submit. We do not believe that they would endure half as long as the South has borne inconceivably greater wrongs and perils. The case supposed is evidently exactly parallel with the issue actually made between the great dominant party at the North and all of the slave-

holding States. We have only to substitute slavery for manufactures, and the Southern for the New England States, to show that the correspondence is perfect. If there is any difference, it can only be found in an assumed distinction between slavery and manufactures. We have no space to enter upon the discussion of the many questions here suggested. It is referred to, only because it leads to the inquiry: How far is the great dominant Northern party to be regarded as an Abolition or anti-slavery party? We think that we are as fully competent to answer this question as the Princeton writer, or any other Northern man. We have had much more imperative reasons for studying the history of the origin and progress of abolitionism, and we think that we can state the results of our observation so as to defy contradiction.

There are, first, the Abolitionists proper, relatively not very numerous, but absolutely a very large body of intensely earnest men and women, embracing a considerable variety of opinion, from the extreme views of Garrison and Phillips, down through the Beechers and Albert Barnes, to the mildest form of the doctrine. These are all agreed that slaveholding is a sin of the deepest dye. They all feel bound in conscience to bear testimony against it, and, by some means, to cause it to cease from the earth. Some of them would employ fire and sword, and even the coward murderer's weapon, poison. Others content themselves with railing and fierce denunciation. They all believe that they are under solemn personal obligations to labor for the extinction of slavery from this land, and from the whole earth.

The second class feel what the Princeton reviewer calls "a moral disapprobation of the system of slavery." The formula in which they sum up their views is: "Slavery is a great political, social and moral evil." What they mean by moral evil, as distinguished from sin, we know not. We give them, however, the benefit of the distinction. It

is not a sin, but a moral evil, to be discountenanced, repressed, and gradually, but as quickly as possible, abolished. There are various opinions among this class of persons, as to the nature and extent of the moral evil of slavery. Some of them can hardly be distinguished from the genuine Abolitionists, while others shade off gently into the next class. There is, however, among this great body of Northern men, one broad, well marked distinction, which is very pertinent to our present discussion. There are many whose moral disapprobation, like that of the Quakers in the South, does not demand an expression in outward word or action. Others, and, we think, by far the largest part, think that it is their solemn duty to prevent the extension of the great moral evil, and, by all lawful means, to labor for its extinction. These are the men who have swelled up the fearful majorities of the great sectional party.

There is a third class, who think that slavery is a social and political evil, analagous to despotic government, in the State. They contend, very earnestly, that it is not a sin, and, therefore, no bar to Christian fellowship in the Churches. They regard slaveholders as men who ought to be pitied, rather than condemned—as unfortunate, but not criminal. It ought to be said, here, that some of the "moral disapprobation" men, however, inconsistently take the same view as to Christian fellowship with slaveholders. Multitudes of this third class feel bound, not in conscience, but as wise and prudent men, to prevent the extension of slavery beyond its present limits, for the advantage of the white race.

There is a fourth class at the North, who look at the whole subject of slavery with the eyes of Southern men.

If these statements are even approximately correct, then it appears that the Republican party is composed of all who feel that they have any duty to perform with respect to the repression or extinction of slavery, either on religious,

moral, social, or political grounds. There are, therefore, two spirits, so blended that they can hardly be distinguished even by the analysis of thought, which constitute the life and soul of the great political party which has subverted the Constitution and dissolved the Union of the American States. They are abolitionism and sectionalism. The dominant party is manifestly a sectional party, and slavery is the subject upon which it has joined issue with the South, and upon which it has finally and fatally triumphed.

In political union with such a party, and under its uncontrollable domination, the Southern man feels that he is subjugated. He is the citizen of a conquered province—conquered in and under, through and by the forms of the Constitution, but in defiance of its essential spirit, and in spite of the solemn prophetic warnings of the great Washington. Under such rule the Southern man sees clearly, not only that he can never be a dominant power in the country, as he never has been, but that he can never again have any part in the Government. He can have no effective voice in making the laws which he and his children are to obey. No Southern man, nor his descendant to the remotest generation, except by being a renegade to his own section, can ever again aspire to the office of President of the United States, or Vice President. He can never again occupy a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court, nor hold a place in the Cabinet. Never more can he represent his Government at the Court of any foreign Power. In the halls of Congress he can do nothing but utter unavailing remonstrances, or make a factious, but helpless and hopeless, opposition to the designs of his oppressors. He can fill the offices of the Customs in his own State, or occupy the place of village Postmaster, but it will be upon the same condition of inevitable degradation which attended the Jewish Publican under the Roman domination. Under these circumstances, he feels that he can have no security for life or property, except in the forbearance of his rulers, or in his

own right arm. He sees that he is for ever shut up in his present home; that he can never emigrate to any other part of this vast unoccupied continent, unless he will consent to sacrifice his worldly wealth, and sunder domestic ties which wind around his heart with a tenderness and power not dreamed of by those who dismiss their domestic *help* with less regret than they sell a horse or part with a favorite dog. It is in no caviling spirit that he asks: How long will the Constitution retain its present form, to remind the oppressor of his wrong, and to recall the memory of those days when, for the maintenance of that Constitution as the fortress of his liberties, the Southern man poured out his blood, like water, upon every battle field where the armies of the Republic met a common foe? The Southern man sees that all this happens to him at once, under the Constitution as already subverted by the dominant sectional majority. All this was upon him, or in immediate prospect, on the very day that the fatal tidings thrilled along the magnetic wires, all over the land, that Abraham Lincoln had been elected by an overwhelming sectional majority, as a Northern, sectional, anti-slavery President of the United States.

There is but one other point that we need examine to complete the answer, under the first head, to the question: Why the Southern States desire to secede?

It is the deliberate conviction of the great majority of Southern statesmen, that the conflict of opinion in the Union is over. The last battle has been fought, and the combined forces of abolitionism and sectionalism have triumphed, finally and fatally triumphed, over the Constitution, over the principles of the fathers, over the rights and liberties of the South, and over the hopes of mankind. Southern men have watched, with intense solicitude, the rising from the abyss, first, of the spirit of abolitionism, and then of the spirit of sectionalism. They have seen them expand separately, and then coalesce. They have

anxiously watched their embodiment, and have beheld them, with unspeakable horror and grief, looming up into a gigantic living organism in the self-styled Republican party. They have seen the rapid growth of this giant in four short years, between the defeat of Fremont and the amazing success of Lincoln; and now they behold it, with one huge hand repressing national men and parties at the North, while the other is stretched out to subjugate and crush the South. So far as the Southern man can judge, this giant is destined to a long and vigorous life. The causes which have led to the origin, growth and final success of the great sectional party, are not merely constant in their operation; they act with accelerated force. Viewed in this aspect, the pervading and growing anti-slavery sentiment of the North becomes terribly significant. If other evidence were wanting of the prevalence of the sectional feeling, we have it sadly enough in this article of the Princeton Review—the very last place where we would have expected to find it. In this point of view, the denunciations of the Abolitionists; the John Brown invasion, and his canonization as saint and martyr; the activity of the under-ground railroad; the sending of incendiary emissaries to the South; the nullification of the fugitive slave law; the violent rescue of apprehended fugitives by mobs of free negroes and white clergymen; the rupture of the Democratic party, and, still more, the division of the great Methodist, Baptist, and New School Presbyterian denominations—together with a thousand minor manifestations of the anti-slavery and sectional spirits—have a profound and fearful meaning. The South believes that no power can exorcise these twin spirits of abolitionism and sectionalism but the mighty power of God. No power on earth can stem this flood. The conscience, the pride, the fanaticism, the sense of duty, the prejudice, the envy, jealousy and resentment of supposed Southern assumption, as well as the hatred of various persons and various classes against

the South, all have contributed to swell this ever-rising tide, which has, at last, in the triumph of the Republican party, overwhelmed the rights and liberties of the Southern States, and threatens to sweep away into indiscriminate ruin their whole social fabric. Is there any hope that this tide will recede? Does the history of the world present an instance where men who have, for years, with mingled prayers and curses, toiled for the possession of power, have, when the sceptre was within their grasp, voluntarily laid it down? What hope can the South cherish that the great sectional majority will not be permanent? She sees that Territory after Territory is ready to wheel into the line of this great host, while the fiat has gone forth that never again shall a slaveholding State be admitted to the Confederacy; and that the States where slavery now exists shall be surrounded by a cordon of free States, and, like a girdled tree, shall die.

The reply to all this is, that the Constitution is the safeguard of minorities. It may, perhaps, protect the rights of minorities, in the proper sense of that term; but, in the nature of the case, it can afford no security to a subjugated section of the country. It must be apparent to the dullest comprehension, that there is a radical and essential difference between the attempt of a majority to oppress the minority, when the two parties are intermingled in all the various relations of life, and an effort to subdue and tyrannize over a great geographical division of the land. If the majority should control all the departments of Government, the judicial, as well as legislative and executive, constitutional protection would amount to very little in either case, but it would be utterly nugatory with respect to the weaker geographical section. Besides, it has been loudly proclaimed that there is a higher law than the Constitution, which controls the consciences of the dominant majority to set at naught the stipulations of that solemn compact. We freely admit that there is a higher law than any earthly con-

stitution, but it is not registered in the moral instincts of fallen man. It is found only in the revealed will of God; but, find it where we may, it can never authorize men to swear to support a Constitution, and then to disregard its compacts, or, by false interpretations, to abrogate its plainest provisions. It never gave any man a warrant to add the baseness of fraud to the guilt of perjury. Such a law would have furnished a conclusive reason for not entering into the covenant, or it might now justify the Northern States in seceding from the Union, to which the South would most cordially yield her assent. When, therefore, the South is told that the Constitution is her security against the tyranny of the majority, they point to the nullification of the fugitive slave law; they listen to the wild outcry against the decisions of the Supreme Court, and, above all, to the solemnly declared purpose of the dominant party to reverse the judgment of that Court, and, by legislative enactment, to wrest from them the whole common territory of the nation. Who will stay the hand of this great party, when, clothed with the ermine and wielding the sword, it holds the Southern States as victims in its grasp?

It is said that the only use that will be made of power by the dominant section, will be to restrain the evil of slavery from spreading, by preventing its extension beyond its present limits. This, it is contended, is a very righteous course, of which the South has no right to complain; because, forsooth, "slavery is not natural or national, but a local institution, the creature of municipal law." If this were not so, it is argued that the slaveholder would have the right to reside with his slaves in England, or France, or any other State, in defiance of public sentiment and the laws of the land. This seems to be regarded as a *reductio ad absurdum;* and this is the reasoning by which the tyrannical majority think to justify the spoliation of the South of those lands for which they paid their money and shed their blood. If put to the proof, they would find it very

difficult to show the absurdity of the claim of the slave-holder to reside in England or France. If right prevailed over might, and, with respect to the true interests of the African race, mercy triumphed over judgment, it might well be that the Southern gentleman would be allowed to dwell securely, with his domestic circle of whites and blacks, within hearing of the eloquence of Exeter Hall. The Southern States, however, have made no such claim. They have never demanded such a privilege, as due either by right or courtesy. The South has always contended earnestly for the right of sovereign States to determine all such questions for themselves. Massachusetts or New York have the right, in their sovereign capacity, not by an *ex post facto*, but by a prospective law, to declare that, within their borders, there shall be no more property in horses or cattle, in sheep or swine, as well as in the services of the African slave, or in the services of any man by contract of hiring. If it be said that property in the beasts of the field is a natural right, by direct grant from their great Creator, we reply, that a right of property in the service of man, whether by hiring, by purchase, or hereditary descent, is, also, by the direct and positive permission of the Sovereign Lord. Though the conditions of the grant differ, according to the nature of the subject, the right is no clearer in the one case than in the other. As this right of property in any subject is simply by permission, and not by command, it may, perhaps, be true that earthly sovereignties, within their own jurisdiction, may modify its exercise, or abolish it altogether, for reasons of mere policy; but in no case can any right of property, in any subject whatever, be the creature of municipal law. If this were the only title of the Southern man to the services of his slave, he would have no right at all. If it could be made clear to Southern men that their right to hold their slaves had no other foundation than the laws which they themselves have made, there are thousands upon thousands who would at once abandon

all claim to their services. This favorite dogma of the Republicans, and also of multitudes of others at the North, is more erroneous than that of the Abolitionists. The only fault of their reasoning is, that the minor premise is false; but this statement, that slavery is only the creature of municipal law, involves the same false premise, with a fallacy besides. No honest man at the South would hold any property upon any such terms. The Southern Christian will thank no man for absolving him from sin in holding slaves, when he is told that the standard of absolution is not the law of God, but the municipal law of his own enacting. If he holds his slaves by no other right than the might of human law, or the might of arms, he will not hold them at all. It would be interesting to discuss the right of human sovereignties to abolish the right of property without the consent of the individual holder, except for public purposes and with due compensation made; but, for all the purposes of this argument, it is admitted.

There is nothing in the nature of slavery to restrain its movements, any more than the possession of flocks and herds. So, when the patriarch Abraham emigrated to the new territory which God had given, he took with him not only his cattle, but his servants, born in his house and bought with his money. If, therefore, there is nothing in the nature of slavery to restrain him, the Southern man demands: What sovereignty under heaven prevents him from emigrating, as Abraham did, with all his household and all his wealth, to the land which the Lord has given him, as tenant in common with his Northern and Western neighbors? What power undertakes to deprive him of his just proportion of the land, for the acquisition of which he contributed not only his money, but the lives of his sons? Thinking thus, there is no logic, however specious, which can convince the South that the doctrine of "Free Soil" is any thing else than the doctrine of robbery. Both in what it grants and in what it denies, it is the old

principle, as old as Nimrod, that "might makes right." The great dominant majority have the might, and they have solemnly declared that they will make it right. When the Southern man complains that he is thus deprived of his equal rights of property in the Territories, he is answered by the puerile fallacy, that he can move into the common Territories with all the property that any Northern man can carry with him. Suppose that the dominant majority should declare, that no Southern man should settle in any of the Territories with more than two coats, or more than fifty dollars in his pocket. Why should they not? There would be more reason and right in it, than to forbid him to take with him all the members of his family. Suppose that he should have no more sense than to complain, would not his mouth be for ever stopped by the answer, You have all the rights that your Northern neighbor has; he is the possessor of only one coat, and has no money at all; you have, therefore, more rights than he has, and are more than his equal, by the full sum of fifty dollars? If the dominant majority was with the South, and the law should be enacted prohibiting the establishment of any sort of manufactories throughout the whole public domain, how would the sturdy New Englander look when told by the South, We do you no wrong, you are equal in all respects to us, we have no manufactures, and we do not desire to have any, so you have all the rights that we have? Would he, with a quiet smile, respond: You are right, and I must go back to Lowell, or Worcester, where alone I can pursue my avocations? No! He would say as the South says, Out upon such logic, and out upon such political morality! That honest, and even truly pious men can reason thus, can only be accounted for on supposition of an intense "moral disapprobation of slavery," deep down in their hearts, depriving it of all the incidents which pertain to every other human interest.

It thus becomes as clear as the sun at mid-day, that the great dominant sectional party was organized, either upon deep convictions of the immorality of slavery—upon the basis of the higher law of their own moral instincts, regardless of the covenanted rights of the South—or else it is a great robber-party, banded together with the intent to despoil their brethren of their share of the joint property, by the strong hand. Were we to emulate the charity of the Princeton Review, we might say that the latter was the motive of the leaders, and that they had taken advantage of the conscientious convictions of the multitude to secure the rich spoil. But no, we will not follow the example. We believe that the "moral disapprobation" of slavery, however wickedly erroneous, is, for the most part, honest; we believe that anti-slavery is the spirit, the soul and vital breath of the great sectional party, which has subverted the Constitution and dissolved the Union of the North American States. We believe that this "moral disapprobation" is increasing at the North, and that it is seeking more and more to find its expression in political action. We see it pervading the logic, the ethics, and the politics of the Princeton Review, and going far to neutralize its religious opinion that slavery is not sinful.

We come now to the second and last reason why the Southern States desire to secede. It is that the issue made up between the great Northern majority, and the Southern States, now in a hopeless minority, relates chiefly to the subject of slavery, a social institution existing at the South, and not existing at all at the North. In order to the full comprehension of this point, of transcendent magnitude and importance, it would be necessary to study, minutely and comprehensively, the history of the origin and progress of African slavery in North America. Then we must examine, carefully, the nature of the institution, and its vital relation to all the interests of the States in which it now exists. We have space only for a very brief, but we hope

that it will prove a satisfactory, glance at either of these topics.

The slavery of the African race in North America had its origin in what men call an accident; its beginnings were very small, and, humanly speaking, fortuitous. In the year 1620, a Dutch vessel, driven by stress of weather, entered the Capes of Virginia, having on board twenty heathen Africans, who were sold as slaves to the Virginia colonists. Within the next twenty years slaves were found in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and soon after in most of the British colonies on this continent. Very soon it became apparent that the African laborer could not be made serviceable, under the rigorous climate of the Northern colonies, and that the tendency of the system was, by a great law of nature, towards the more genial skies and balmier breezes of the South. This gave rise to very grave apprehensions in the minds of Southern men. The rapid natural increase of the blacks under the fostering wing of Christian civilization; the influx from the North, where their labor was not remunerative; as well as the direct importations from Africa, seemed to threaten that the white race would soon be overwhelmed by a countless horde of heathen negroes. These things excited the fears of the far-seeing statesmen of those days, and they made strenuous efforts to arrest the tide, which threatened to engulph all the dearest interests of the white colonists. The Southern colonies enacted laws to prevent the importation of slaves from the coast of Africa, and many very anxious thoughts were expended on the question, how they should dispose of those who were already in the country. All were agreed that the prospect was very gloomy, and that some thing must be done. The colonial laws prohibiting the African slave trade were annulled by the authority of the British crown, and this is one of the most prominent grievances assigned in the Declaration of Independence as the reason for the secession of the colonies from the British

empire. The importation of slaves, through the agency of British merchants and the people of the Northern maritime colonies, in which New England took the lead, was continued until after the acknowledgement of the independence of the United States. For a time the apprehensions of the South appeared to slumber, but as the numbers of the slaves continued to increase, they were again aroused, and by the earnest efforts of Southern men, against all the influence of those engaged in the traffic, the slave trade was finally abolished. The Northern States afterwards gradually abolished slavery. They were enabled to accomplish this, because the South afforded a market for those who were unwilling to sacrifice their money invested in slaves, and the scheme of abolition was carried out without difficulty, because the number upon whom the ordinance of emancipation took effect was too insignificant to render them a formidable element in the social state; while, scattered through the rural districts, the freed negroes could do but little harm, and caused, therefore, but little uneasiness. The natural tendency, however, of this class is to congregate in towns and cities, and they have since become a very troublesome element of crime and pauperism, causing much anxiety to the municipal authorities of Northern cities. After the line was distinctly drawn between the States employing hired labor and those in which slavery continued to exist, the still rapid natural increase of the slaves seemed to portend that their numbers would soon greatly exceed the possibility of their profitable employment, and even go beyond the productiveness of the soil, so that starvation stared them in the face. By natural causes slavery was confined to certain definite limits, just as the Free Soil party would confine it now. The prospect before the Virginia planter was gloomy enough, and his experience is too recent to make the South willing to repeat the experiment. The danger was, not that slavery would die of inanition, but that the lack of bread would,

as it always has, among all people, produce destructive convulsions, ruinous alike to the black and white races; the peril would have been much greater if they had had any other race to deal with. The fears of the slaveholders were greatly exaggerated, and we must confess that they were enhanced by an underlying moral disapprobation of the system of slavery, and an undefined dread that they were exposing themselves to the judgment of God.*

It was under these circumstances, and in view of these dangers, which were real, but not near so great as they appeared to them, that all those utterances of condemnation, and expressions of fear of the system of slavery, fell from the lips and pens of Southern men, which the Abolitionists of our day have quoted so dishonestly, yet with such telling effect upon the minds of the Northern people.

It was during this period that the various religious bodies made their deliverances on the subject of slavery, and among them the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted, in 1818, a series of resolutions looking very earnestly toward the gradual emancipation of the slaves. These resolutions were drawn up by Southern men, who were themselves slaveholders, and they were passed by the votes of Southern ministers and elders. With reference to other denominations, a rigid adherence to the modes of thought and feeling of those days has led to the disruption of the Churches; while the Old School

* There is some apparent discrepancy between some of the statements in the preceding historical sketch and some that appeared in the concluding article of the last number of this journal, in reference to the abolition of the slave-trade. The disagreement, however, is not real, for with reference to the States of South Carolina and Georgia, that distinguished writer and ourselves are speaking of different times. Moreover, we have, for the most part, had Virginia in our mind. The only points we wish to make are: First, the experience of some of the slaveholding States as to the confining of slavery; and secondly, the true historical and ecclesiastical status of the action of 1818, by our General Assembly.

Presbyterian Church, commonly regarded as so tenacious of the past, and even reproached as a fossil Church, and her doctrines derided as fossil Christianity, has had the wisdom given her to understand the progress of events, and to keep fully abreast of the age. The action of 1818 still stands upon her records, not as the law, but the history of the subject; and Southern Presbyterians are well content that it should so stand. It is, for them, the incontestible evidence that their fathers did, in good faith, and in the exercise of all the wisdom and philanthropy that God had given them, make an earnest and persistent effort to solve the problem of African slavery in America by some feasible and safe method of emancipation. In this they were joined, with all their force of talents, genius and virtue, by both Christian and infidel statesmen. Their combined power could accomplish nothing. The older men of that day continued to dream of emancipation as long as they lived. They all seized upon the scheme of African colonization, as opening a door of hope. Some were very sanguine; all were willing to give it a fair trial. It was, at last, made perfectly manifest, not only by their utter inability to discover the way, but by the fearful failure of the experiment, on a small scale, in the British West Indies, that the problem of slavery could not be solved by any scheme of abolition, emancipation or colonization. The two first could only complicate it, while the last was utterly insufficient. Still, the slaves continued to multiply, and the danger of over population grew apace.

When hope began to depart, and the evils of shutting up slavery within narrow limits began in some measure to be realized, the providence of God opened the door of safety, by the operation of causes originating at points distant from each other by the whole length of the continent and the width of the broad Atlantic. The invention of the cotton-gin in Connecticut, and the spinning-jenny in Britain, almost simultaneously with the opening for set-

tlement of the vast region of the South suited to the production of cotton, were the instruments by which the safety-valve of the huge machinery was raised. These things came just when Southern Christians and statesmen were at their wit's end. The hope of relief from emancipation had faded away, and all were dreading a terrible explosion from the pent-up elements of unknown power confined within limits too strait for them. From that day to this, amazing progress and prosperity have blessed the Southern States, threatened only by the foolish and wicked meddling of men, like silly boys, who know nothing of the nature and powers of the vast machinery which they so recklessly handle, the explosion of which would as surely cause their destruction as that of the men to whom God, in His providence, has committed its guidance and control. The South has great reason to be thankful that the great enginery that propels the bark which contains her social fortunes is so hard to disarrange, else ruin might have ensued long ago. We have before intimated our belief that one-half as much reckless and wicked interference with the social machinery of the North would, in much less time than thirty years, have produced an explosion, scattering it to the four winds of heaven. Its fragments could only be cemented again by the blood of untold thousands of people, and under the iron sceptre of a single despot.

The lesson which the South has learned from this whole history is, never to consent that her social system should be confined and restrained by any other limits than such as the God of nature interposes; and, above all, not to submit to the imposition of such restraints by another section of the country, whose fortunes are not embarked in the same vessel, whose motives can only be a spurious, fanatical philanthropy, or the lust of power; and whose domination, from the nature of the case, can be nothing but a fearful

and hateful tyranny—the tyranny, not of one man, but of a many-headed monster.

We come now to the nature of the subject on which the great dominant party have joined issue with the Southern States. Slavery has been very variously defined by different writers on the law of Nature and of Nations. Justinian defines it as "a constitution of the law of nations by which a man is made subject to another, contrary to nature." In the sense in which nature is here used, all human governments, and the more complex laws of the social systems of men, are constitutions of the law of nations contrary to nature. According to Grotius, "slavery is an obligation to serve another for life, in consideration of diet and other common necessaries." Rutherforth makes it "an obligation to be directed by another in all one's actions;" and Montesquieu says it is "the establishment of a right which gives one man such power over another as renders him absolute master over his life and fortune." These definitions are all framed with reference to the system of slavery as it existed in the Roman Empire, and it is not a little remarkable that the mildest in its conception of the subject is that of Justinian, to whom alone, of them all, the system was a matter of personal observation and experience. They are none of them applicable to slavery as it exists in America. We shall endeavor to give a succinct description, rather than a formal definition, of the system as actually existing at the South.

Slavery, then, is a constitution of the law of nature and of nations, by which, under certain providential conditions, one man has a right to incorporate into his family institution, and to hold under his rule, as the head of the house, a class of persons of a different, and, in all the attributes which fit men for self-government, an inferior race; and to exact from them, while in health and vigor, service and labor suited to their strength and capacity. In return for this service, he is to exercise over them a just and equal

authority, restraining them, by appropriate rewards and disciplinary inflictions, from idleness, vice and immorality. He is to protect them from wrong and outrage on the part of others; to nourish them in helpless infancy and feeble old age; to treat them with kindness, and to feel towards them the regard to which they are entitled as the servants of his house and the subjects of his family-government. He is to afford them the means and opportunity of becoming acquainted with the Gospel of God's grace, in its purity and power, and to guard them, both by precept and authority, against the errors and heresies which would destroy their souls, or make them turbulent members of his family.

The providential conditions, mentioned in the description, may be various. With reference to slavery in America, they are the historical events which we have briefly detailed. Now, it is true that very few slaveholders fulfil all the duties arising out of their relation as masters. Neither do the slaves perform their obligations so fully as they ought. We frankly confess that there are occasional instances of caprice and cruelty. The same things must, also, be said of all the relative social duties which men owe in the various relations of life.

The conclusion to which we come, from this very imperfect exhibition of the history and nature of slavery in the South, is, that it is emphatically a domestic institution. The relation of master and servant is a family relation. Questions relating to slavery are almost all social questions. The great problem which the system of slavery presents for solution to the Christian, the philanthropist and statesman, is preëminently a social problem. As a vital social interest, it has very few points of contact with politics, even in States where it is recognized by the laws; and it touches the general politics of the United States only at the two points specifically mentioned in the Constitution. The Federal Government has, therefore, no more right to abolish slavery, by direct or indirect legislation,

either in the States or Territories, than it has to divorce, by general law, every husband and wife in New York or Pennsylvania. From the very nature of social institutions, the Congress of the United States has no more right to forbid a Southern man to settle in the common Territories with his slaves, as part of his household, than it has to enact that a Southern man shall not go thither with his children. The ground upon which we maintain this is not that the relation of parent and child is, as to all of its incidents, the same as that of master and servant. We only contend that they are both lawful social relations; and, therefore, it would be just as proper to make one the subject of political strife and political domination as the other. The territorial question, therefore, upon which the issue is specifically joined, is, not merely what property the Southern man shall or shall not take with him to the common heritage of the nation? but, What members of his household shall he be compelled to leave behind? From the nature of the case, as well as by the laws of the States where slavery exists, servants are both persons and property.

As a social institution, moreover, slavery has very close affinities with religion. The social and the religious life of man have ever been inseparably blended, while, even under the old Jewish Theocracy, they were related in a comparatively slight degree with the political constitution of the nation. Social questions, therefore, involve the conscience almost as much as those which relate to religion. And this furnishes an imperative reason why the subject of slavery should never have been drawn into the vortex of political strife. Above all other questions, this ought never to have been made the issue between two sections of the nation. It would have been exceedingly dangerous, even if slavery had existed in every State of the Union; but, in the actual state of things, it might easily have been foreseen, as the event has proved, that it would be fatal. We are sorry to say it, but we honestly believe that it would

have been safer for the perpetuity of the Union if the great dominant party had been organized upon a distinctly religious basis. We have neither time nor inclination to pursue the subject here suggested; but the political history of the country, embracing the period between the disappearance of the Whig party and the rise of the Republican, has very profound lessons for the statesmen of all free countries.

Such are the considerations which, in the minds of Southern men, give such terrible significance to the triumph of the sectional party. They feel that, under the government of the dominant sectional majority, they are reduced, not only to political subjection, but to social slavery. The very sanctity of their hearthstone is invaded. So far as the principle is concerned, they can see no difference between the abolition of slavery in the States, and their exclusion as slaveholders, and because they are slaveholders, from the lands to which they have equal title with their Northern neighbors. The right to do the one involves the right to do the other, and it is the certain expectation of the Northern anti-slavery men that, if they restrain the extension of slavery, they will thereby constrain its abolition. In either case, the Federal compact is broken, the Constitution subverted, and the Union dissolved, by that party which, by the mere force of numbers, has seized upon the Government with the boldly avowed purpose of domineering by the very firesides of the Southern people. Since the days of Papal interdicts and the Spanish Inquisition, no nation under heaven has ever quietly submitted to such tyranny. Did the Princeton writer think that the men of the South would submit?

We will now briefly sum up the causes which have driven the Southern States to secession.

First: The triumph of a great sectional party, which, if it be permanent, will for ever exclude the Southern people from all participation in the government of the country,

and from having any voice in making the laws by which they themselves are to be ruled.

Secondly: The certainty which they feel, from the history of the rise and growth of that party, that its power will last; the causes of which are still at work, with accelerated force, and there is no opposing power that can withstand their progress.

Thirdly: The basis upon which that party rests, is hostility, more or less violent, against an institution which exists at the South, and does not exist at all at the North; an institution in which the North has no manner of interest, and for which they sustain no sort of responsibility; an institution guaranteed to the South, by the compact which constituted the Federal Union; an institution which has been thrown upon the South by the inscrutable providence of God, and which, in the course of events, has become so interwoven with the warp and woof of Southern society, that they can not get rid of it, if they would.

Fourthly: This institution of slavery is social, and not political, and, therefore, the last of all subjects for political domination. As a social institution it has very close relations with the religious life of the people, involving grave questions of conscience, for the decision of which they are answerable only to God. This institution, therefore, belongs, not to the outward form of the State, but to its inner life, and, like the vital parts of the human frame, can not endure the delicate touch of the skillful surgeon, much less the rude handling of the ignorant quack.

The subject matter, therefore, concerning which the sectional party has declared its purpose of dominating over the South, is no mere question of political expediency or inexpediency; it is no mere question of right and wrong. It is the simple question of existence, both for the master and the slave; it is a matter of liberty or subjugation, of life or death. Submission to the plans and purposes of the Northern majority is death—death with dishonor; resist-

ance may be death, if the Northern rulers should be so far given up as to attempt to subdue the South by force; resistance may be death, but it will be death with glory—the glory of the patriot. If resistance should be successful, the pen of history will inscribe the names of the great Southern statesmen by the side of Hancock and Henry, Adams and Jefferson, while their great captains will rank with Washington and Green, Putnam and Marion. But should the South be finally crushed, under the weight of superior numbers, her general, whose lot it shall be to hold the last citadel, and to fall in the final ruin of his country, may well claim brotherhood with Kosciusco. We trust that she will not fail; we trust that the good and righteous God who has protected her, lo! these many years, will shield her head in the day of battle, and that He will enable His beloved Church in these Southern lands to fulfil the mission upon which He has sent her, to white and black, to bond and free.

After all that has been said, it is hardly necessary for us to discuss the right of secession. We are constrained, however, to offer a few words on this subject, because the conduct of the Southern people has been stigmatized as treason, and as involving "manifold absurdities, abnormities and evils," subversive of the laws of God, and destructive of the rights of man. Southern Christians, who have taken part in this great movement for liberty, are called traitors, and denounced as guilty of the highest crime that can be committed against man, and one of the most heinous against the authority of God.

Until this new conflict between liberty and despotism began, we had always thought that the American Revolution had for ever settled the great principle, that government was made for man, not man for government, and, therefore, both as a historical fact and a necessary logical inference, the Union was made by and for the States, not the States by or for the Union. It seems, however, that we were

mistaken; the war of the American Revolution settled nothing. The despotic theory is now held more tenaciously, and exhibited more offensively, by men calling themselves Republicans, than by the ministerial party under Lord North. The great question of self-government is yet to be determined. The only change which eighty-four years of the conflict of opinion has made, is simply the substitution of a tyrannical sectional majority, for a tyrannical King and Parliament. If we had space, it would be very instructive to exhibit, in parallel columns, the absolute identity of the principles of government maintained by the ruling powers of Britain in that day, and by the leaders of the sectional majority of our own times. The only difference that we can see is, that our British masters were content with political domination, while our American rulers would extend their authority over the social life and consciences of the Southern people. If other evidences were wanting that the Republicans of our day have not receded a single step from the positions of Lord North and his fellow-coercionists, it may be found in the preposterous comparison of a State of the American Confederacy, with a county or district of a consolidated empire. This is a favorite illustration of the ruling party, and the Princeton writer can boast of the endorsement of President Lincoln himself, for he rang the changes upon it during his recent triumphant progress to his capital city. Now, even if this comparison were well founded, it would not prove that the people of the so-called Southern counties or districts were traitors, as tried either by the law of God or the principles of the Revolution. They would stand just where our fathers stood, with all the rights that they ever had to resist oppression, whether of monarch, parliament or sectional majority. In that case their resistance might be properly termed revolutionary, and then the lessons of the old war of Independence might well teach the Northern rulers to consent to the peaceful dismemberment of their empire. There is, however, no

sort of analogy between the sovereign States of North America and the counties or provinces of the British Empire; the former are manifestly organic bodies politic, possessing each its own political life, the latter are simply convenient divisions for municipal purposes. They differ, therefore, in their essential nature, as widely as a living man differs from one of the phrenologist's divisions of the human cranium. This is an existing reality, palpable to the eyes of all observers; it is a fact founded upon great historical verities, and not the out-growth of subtle political theories.

The wonderful providence of God, which determined the circumstances of the settlement of this continent by European colonists, and which decided the manner and the result of their struggle for independence, settled the question of the nature and condition of these States upon a basis which no constitution could materially alter, and which nothing but an absolute conquest could entirely change. The only possible union between States of such an historical origin must be founded either in compact or conquest. If, then, as all men know was the case, the union of these States was formed by agreement, any attempt, by the majority of the States or people, to change its essential nature from a union by agreement into one of conquest, does of itself break up the Government and resolve it into its constituent elements. The original contracting parties were not individuals or households, but independent, organized States. The right of secession, therefore, as exercised by the Southern States, is nothing more than the declaration that, the essential nature of the Union having been changed from compact to conquest, they will not submit to the usurpation. Who, then, are the traitors? Surely not the men of the South.

Besides, it is clear that in a Government having such a historical origin, and such an inherent nature, a revolution, wrought, not by the people as an aggregate of individuals, but by the people as organized sovereignties, must be spe-

cifically different from a revolution accomplished under any other system. This manifest difference is expressed by the right of secession, as distinguished from the right of revolution. The chief characteristic of the difference is peace. The right of secession may, therefore, be called the right of peaceful revolution. The circumstances under which this right ought to be exercised, as determined by great moral principles, are the same that, in any other kind of government, would justify an appeal to arms. We have always thought that the one great benefit which our fathers secured for themselves and for us, their children, and which, under God, they were able to secure by the peculiar conditions of their colonial history, was the right, and the possibility, of maintaining their liberties in any future contingency, without the disintegration of society, and without a resort to war and bloodshed.

It is a faint and dim recognition of this great principle, as involved in the essential nature, as well as in the whole history, of the Government, that compels the advocates of "coercion" to resort to the miserable quibble about "enforcing the laws and protecting the public property." So, also, those opponents of coercion who fail to recognize or fear to acknowledge this principle, are reduced to the necessity of special pleading on the tremendous issues that now divide the country. They contend that the laws can only be enforced, or the possession of property recovered, by regular legal process, in execution of the judgment of a Court of competent jurisdiction, and that the military power can only be called in to aid the marshals in the lawful service of judicial writs. All this is true; but it renders the Government a nullity, and stultifies its makers inconceivably more than the doctrine of secession. If the dominant party should send fire and sword to desolate peaceful Southern homes, and slaughter unoffending people, the most horrible feature of the hideous attempt will be that it is done under cover of a mere subterfuge. This

is a terrible example of the fallacy called *ignoratio elenchi.* The thing supposed to be proved is: The laws must be enforced. The real conclusion: A noble people must be subjugated, or at least punished, for daring to assert that freedom is their birthright.

The right of secession, as we have thus briefly defined it, is the right of peaceful and orderly revolution, by the organized States, for adequate cause. The possibility of capricious, unreasonable secession, without the right to coerce by the remaining confederates, and without the possibility of coercion, except under the fallacy and subterfuge which we have now exposed, is one of the dangers incident to a free Government constituted as was ours. The Constitution of the United States was the best system of government for a free people ever devised by man; but, like all human things, it was imperfect. Like its authors, it contained in its own nature the seeds of death. The dangers to which it was exposed were just two—separation and consolidation; the possibility of secession, and the possibility of sectional domination. The danger arising from these two sources was by no means equally great, for secession was a moral impossibility so long as liberty and prosperity were enjoyed in the Union. Secession, therefore, from mere caprice or passion, has always been a possible, but by no means a probable, result. Massachusetts is said to have voted to secede upon the admission of Texas, but she had the good sense not to carry it into execution. If she had fulfilled her passionate threat, it would have done little or no harm. The Union would hardly have been jostled by the recoil. All the movements of the Government could have been easily and safely adjusted to the new state of affairs. The right of secession, therefore, involved only a remote possibility of danger, and that of no great magnitude; while, at the same time, it contained an element of safety, inasmuch as it was an effectual check upon the tendency to centralization and tyranny of the General Government.

On the other hand, the danger of consolidation and sectional domination was always imminent, and, if it should at any time be realized, fatal. This was the danger against which Washington so solemnly warned his countrymen, and all true patriots have feared it ever since the ratification of the Constitution. The right of secession, if it had been generally acknowledged, would either have prevented the attempt, or would have averted mutual slaughter, in a vain effort to maintain sectional authority. But, whether the Government were a Confederacy or a consolidated Empire; whether the States were sovereignties or only counties of one great nation; the successful effort of any one large section to rule over any other smaller section, by the mere power of numbers, must always have proved fatal to the perpetuity of the Government, unless the people had forgotten the deeds and principles of their fathers, and had lost the very memory of freedom.

This danger, so long apprehended, has come at last; in this the point of its greatest weakness, the Constitution has given way. Upon their heads must the guilt of this ruin fall, who, seeing the danger, have, with insatiate lust of power, broken through the only defence of the weak against the strong, at the only place where a breach could have been made, and where, if once made, it is irreparable.

The only alternative left to Southern freemen is, forcible resistance in the Union, or secession. Some of the States have chosen the latter, because they believe it to be the way of peace, others are hesitating between the two; none of them propose to submit. The seceded States declare, with a solemnity befitting the momentous occasion, that it matters not to them how their course is characterized. Call it the right of secession or the wrong of secession—the right of revolution or the wrong of revolution—call it sedition, insurrection, rebellion, treason, or by any other name drawn from the vocabulary of reproach, they never will submit to be governed by any section of the country on any issue

whatever, great or small. Above all things, they never will submit when the subject matter of the sectional domination is in no sense a matter of political concern, as between the North and the South, but a question involving the social life and the consciences of the people of the Southern States.

ARTICLE II.

COLERIDGE.

An attempt was made, some thirty years ago, by Prof. Marsh and others, to introduce the writings of Coleridge, and to give them currency and favor, in this country. A few young ministers were taken with them, and, for a time, were greatly injured by them. Their thoughts were confused; their style became inflated, obfuscated, filled with outlandish words and strangely constructed sentences, and the complaint among intelligent hearers was, that they could not be understood. They seemed conscious of having great thoughts, and of being the subjects of some special illumination, but few could tell in what the illumination consisted, or what benefit it was likely to be to the world. Coleridgeism had its run in those days, and after a little time it measurably ran out. It was not congenial to the taste and habits of the American people, and, consequently, did not prevail. Most of those who were infected by it, especially if they were pious and sensible men, recovered themselves from it, and returned to the plain teachings of the Bible and of common sense.

We then confidently hoped that our danger from this source was over, and that Mr. Coleridge would never again

be brought forward as a guide, in metaphysics or religion. But in this we have been disappointed. A new edition of his works has since been published, accompanied by an elaborate and commendatory introduction, by Prof. Shedd, of Andover. Mr. Shedd does not, indeed, become responsible for all the strange opinions of Coleridge, yet he highly commends him: first, as "the foremost and ablest opponent of Pantheism;" and, secondly, as "an able defender of the doctrines of Christianity, on grounds of reason and philosophy." What we now propose is, to look into this matter, and see how far these commendations are just. Will it be safe for our Christian youth, young ministers, theological students and others, to accept the guide which is here proffered them?

However much may be said in honor of Coleridge, as a man of genius, we hold that he is *not* to be trusted as a teacher and guide; and we shall endeavor to show as much as this: first, from his manner of life; secondly, from his intellectual character, studies and pursuits; and thirdly, from his latest and most mature opinions on the subject of religion.

We recur, then, first of all, to his general course of life. We naturally wish to know some thing of the characters of those with whom we converse, and who are commended to us for their wisdom.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was born at Ottery, England, in the year 1772. His father, Rev. John Coleridge, was a clergyman of the Church of England, who died when Samuel was eight years old. By the assistance of friends, the child was placed at a public school in London, where he continued for several years. He was distinguished, at this time, for precocity of genius, which showed itself in the ardent and indiscriminate devouring of books. While the other boys were at play, "My whole being," says he, "was, with half-closed eyes, to crumple myself up in a corner, and read, read, read." Nor was he an inattentive or forgetful

reader. His young mind was laden and overladen with the contents of books, crowded together without much order or skill, and about which he could converse, to the admiration of those who heard him.

At the age of nineteen, he became a member of Jesus College, Cambridge; but so bent was he upon indiscriminate reading and conversation, and so averse to the prescribed routine of study, that his connection with the University was of little avail to him. While here, he became a Socinian in religion, and became involved in pecuniary embarrassments. He was also disappointed in an affair of love, and in his desperation he ran away from College, and enlisted in a company of cavalry. After a few months his friends found him, procured his discharge, and got him back to his place in the University; but the confinement did not suit him, and he was soon dismissed.

Fired with French notions of liberty and equality, his next plan was, in connection with several other enthusiastic young men, to migrate to America and set up a new social organization, some where on the Susquehanna river, which they agreed to call *Pantisocracy.* But this project ended, as it began, in talk. It was never consummated.

Within a year of this time, he was married to Miss Sarah Fricker, a sister of the wife of Robert Southey, expecting to support himself and her by his literary efforts. And this he could easily have done, if he had been at all reliable; but, as Mr. Southey says, "No dependence could be placed upon him." Whether he announced a lecture, or promised an article for the press, or accepted an invitation to dine, he was very likely to fail, and thus disappoint and provoke his friends. It was at this time that the Unitarians persuaded him to preach; and he did preach two sermons—one upon "the Corn Laws," and the other upon "the Hair Powder Tax."

In the year 1798, being supported by some liberal friends, he went to Germany, where he continued between one and

two years. Here he drank in, with great avidity, the philosophy of Kant and Schelling, of which he continued to be the admirer and advocate as long as he lived.

At an early period of his life—it is not certainly known how early—Mr. Coleridge became addicted to the use of opium. He commenced taking it to relieve a painful swelling of the knees, and continued it for many years, until he was all but ruined by it. Mr. Southey informs us that "his ordinary consumption of laudanum was from two quarts a week to a pint a day!" Nor was this all. He was addicted to the use of ardent spirits, and "drank them in prodigious quantities."* In these ways, he not only ruined his health, but wasted his substance, so that he entirely neglected his wife and children. He did not even write to them, or so much as open their letters to him. They were kindly taken in and provided for by Mr. Southey, at his own expense.

Through the kind care and ever watchful restraints of a benevolent physician (Dr. Gilman), to whom Coleridge was induced to commit himself, he was enabled to overcome his intemperate habits, but he never recovered from the effects of them. He remained in the family of Dr. Gilman some eighteen years; but they were years of disease, and often of exquisite suffering, and here he ended his life, in the year 1834, at the age of sixty-two.

If it be asked, here, What have Mr. Coleridge's habits, and his course of life, to do with his opinions, and with his qualifications as a teacher in philosophy and religion? we answer, *Much, every way.* Who would be willing to commit himself to such a teacher? Who can have any confidence in opinions formed and uttered under the hallucinations of opium, or flowing from a mind disturbed and broken down under such an influence? In the language of another: "Mr. Coleridge's intemperance had much to

* See Cottle's Reminiscences, pp. 289, 376.

do with his mental idiosyncracies, and with the incomplete and fragmentary character of his published writings; and, beyond a doubt, aggravated those fitful and desultory intellectual habits, which were inherent in him, and ever fostered by him. Nor were the effects of this intemperance, either on his mind or body, ever wholly obliterated, even after he abandoned it."

We come now to speak of the intellectual character and pursuits of Mr. Coleridge, and inquire whether *they* were of a nature to inspire confidence in him, as a guide.

That he was endowed with intellectual abilities far beyond the average of his race, there can be no doubt; his perceptions were keen and quick, and his memory retentive, so that he was enabled to acquire knowledge with great rapidity, and to hold it fast when he had gained it; his thoughts flowed easily, and in channels of their own; they were original and striking, often, and his imagination enabled him to combine them in all the forms of beauty and of art. Nor was he wanting in emotive energy. His feelings were impulsive and strong—too much so, often, for the other parts of his mental constitution; and then, his powers of conversation were unrivalled. All his acquaintances speak of him with admiration in respect to this; the principal difficulty was, he talked too much and too long; he engrossed conversation, and had it all to himself. "Did you ever hear me preach?" said Coleridge, one day, to Charles Lamb. Answer. "I never heard you do any thing else." He could talk with equal fluency and earnestness, whether he had any thing to say or not. Says Carlyle: "I have heard Coleridge talk with eager, musical energy, two stricken hours, his face all the while radiant and moist, and communicate no meaning whatever, to any individual of his hearers, leaving it most uncertain to our ears whether he was uttering oracles or jargon."

Coleridge's great weakness seemed to be one of *will.* He had comparatively no *power of will;* no power to restrain

himself from indulgences to which he was prompted, or to carry out the purposes which he had formed. Hence, the ease with which he ran into intemperate habits, and the invincible control which such habits held over him. He saw the gulf of ruin which yawned for him, and yet he had no power to withdraw, or to stay his footsteps; and hence the many projects—some of them wise, and some foolish—which, in the course of his life, he formed and abandoned; hence the repeated literary efforts which he undertook, and in which he failed, not from any lack of intellectual ability, but simply from the want of a persevering executive power; hence, too, the fragmentary, unfinished character of nearly all his publications, little more than prefaces, introductions to great works which he had in his thoughts, but which he had no power of will to execute; hence the truth of what his brother, Southey, rather pettishly said of him: "There is no dependence to be placed upon him."

This original infirmity of Mr. Coleridge's mental constitution, which might have been remedied by early discipline, was greatly strengthened by indulgence. Instead of submitting to be directed in his studies, he preferred to direct himself; instead of pursuing any thing methodically, and to the end, his habit was to "read, read, read," just those things which pleased him, or which chance threw in his way.

Almost the only thing to which he adhered with unfaltering tenacity, was the German transcendental philosophy, and this, though quite adapted to his genius, was vastly more an injury than a benefit. It was, to his dreamy and partially diseased mind, about the same as opium to his body.

The truth is, we have no faith in this transcendental philosophy; we have no patience with it. It has deluged half Europe with Pantheism and infidelity, and unless stayed in its progress, it would soon deluge the earth. It has corrupted the entire field of German literature, so that, as Mrs. Austen says: "There is not a fairy tale of Tieck, nor

a song of Goethe, nor a play of Schiller, nor a criticism of Schlegel, nor a description of Humboldt," nor (she might have added) a history, ecclesiastical or civil, "in which the under current of speculative philosophy is not visible."

Mr. Coleridge's great teacher and guide, while in Germany, was Schelling. And who was Schelling? What was he? He certainly *was*, in those times, whatever he became afterwards, an *open Pantheist.* He held that "the universe is God, and God the universe; or that God, developing Himself in various forms, and according to general laws, is *the only existence.*" "God," he said, "is the absolute identity of nature and thought, of matter and spirit. Nor is this identity the cause of the universe, but the universe itself—a God—a universe." "In this philosophy of Schelling," says Mr. Coleridge, "I first found a genial coincidence with much that I had toiled out for myself, and a powerful assistance in what I had yet to do." So much was Mr. Coleridge enamored of Schelling, that he translated from him, not only entire passages, but whole pages, and published them, without acknowledgment, as his own. Thus, the discussion in the *Biographia Literaria*, on the reciprocal relations of the *esse* and the *cogitare*, is a literal translation, without acknowledgment, from the Introduction to one of Schelling's works.*

Prof. Shedd thinks that Coleridge renounced the philosophy of Schelling, and fell back upon that of Kant. But we find no formal renunciation of Schelling. Or, if he did renounce him, and return to Kant, it is not certain that he gained much by the change. Kant was the great leader and head of the transcendental philosophers of Germany; he gave the initiative, and those who came after but carried

* That Coleridge plagiarized somewhat extensively, not only from Schelling, but from the German poets, is now pretty generally acknowledged. His friends attribute it to inattention and carelessness; others, to design. See Tait's Magazine for September, 1834; Blackwood, vol. 47, p. 287; and Sir William Hamilton's Notes on the Works of Dr. Reid, p. 890.

out his plan. Kant all but ignored the outer world; they ignored it quite. Kant called it, in his algebra, an x—an unknown quantity; they called it nothing. Kant said that neither the understanding nor the speculative reason can give us any knowledge of God; they said, there is *no God* —no *personal* God—none but the universe. Kant held that "it is of no importance, whether our notions of God are theoretically correct; it is enough that we have a subjective knowledge of Him, in the idea of duty." His followers insisted that it is of no importance whether we believe in any God, or not. Kant was undoubtedly an infidel, and if his followers pushed their infidelity to a greater logical consistency, it is not certain that they were much worse than he.

From these statements, our readers will decide whether Coleridge's change was very much to his advantage, on supposition that he did retreat from some of the extreme positions of Schelling, and take his stand upon the doctrines of Kant. Beyond all question, Kant laid down the principles, he opened the way, which led to the Idealism and Pantheism of his followers. How, then, shall the man, who is set before us as a disciple of Kant, be regarded and trusted by our young ministers and Christians as "the foremost and ablest English opponent of Pantheism?"

It remains that we speak of the matured opinions of Mr. Coleridge, more especially on the subject of religion. Prof. Shedd tells us, that his opinions are not to be gathered from his works generally, but only from his later works; since, in the course of his life, they underwent important changes. And this is undoubtedly true. He renounced Socinianism, and embraced a form of evangelical religion; and it is only of his opinions subsequent to that event that we propose to speak.

Nor are we to expect consistency even in these, for Mr. Coleridge was not a man of consistency. It did not enter into his nature to be consistent. He had bright thoughts, and was able to present them in striking attitudes and lights;

but he had no capacity for contemplating them in their several relations, and uniting them harmoniously into a system. Instead, he seems to have had a singular facility for entertaining propositions that are destructive of each other, without being aware of their inconsistency. From many passages in his writings, it would seem that he believes in a *personal God*, the creator and sovereign of the universe; while in others, his God is but an idea, and that, too, of his own creation.

The Apostle Paul tells us that "the invisible things of God are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made;*" or, in other words, that the existence and perfections of God may be demonstrated from His works. But Mr. Coleridge, like Kant, utterly denies this. "*Assume* the existence of God," says he, "and then the harmony and fitness of the physical creation may be shown to correspond with it, and support it; but to set about *proving* the existence of a God by such means, is a mere circle—a delusion. It can be no proof to a good reasoner, unless he violates all systematic logic, and presumes his conclusion."*

Nor can the intellect or reason arrive at the knowledge of a personal God in any other way. "The dialectic intellect may enable us to affirm the reality of an *absolute being generally*, but here it stops. It can command neither insight nor conviction, concerning the existence, or even the possibility, of the world, as distinct and different from the Deity. It finds itself constrained to confound the Creator with the creation,"† and so ends in Pantheism.

But, if the existence of God can not be proved from His works, nor established by dialectic reason in any other way, how is a knowledge of Him to be gained? By *direct intuition*, says Mr. Coleridge, in one place. The mind has a power, which "bears the same relation to spiritual objects

* Table Talk, vol. 2, p. 429. † Letters, 28, 29.

—the universal, the eternal and the necessary—which the eye bears to material and contingent phenomena."*

In other passages, Mr. Coleridge represents the idea of God as one "commanded by the conscience, and required by the interests of morality." For, says he, although reason can not itself demonstrate the existence of a God, it can furnish us with "the *assumption* or *hypothesis* of a *One*, as the ground and cause of the universe, which is eternal and immutable." Well, the idea, which is the basis of religion, commanded by the conscience, and required by morality, contains the same truth," viz: that "there is a One, the ground and cause of the universe, which is eternal and immutable." "But this idea presents itself to the mind with additional attributes," such as "holiness, providence, love, justice and mercy. It comprehends, moreover, the independent existence and personality of the *Supreme One*, as our Creator, Lord and Judge. The hypothesis of a one ground and principle of the universe is thus raised," by the command of conscience and the requisitions of morality, "into the idea of the living God, the supreme object of our faith, love, fear and adoration."†

What will devout Christians among us think of this mode of coming to the knowledge of God? A mere hypothesis of the reason, raised by the command of conscience, and the requisitions of morality, after having been clothed with some new attributes, into the idea of the living God! And how much better is this new mode of coming to the knowledge of God, than the old Pauline method of inferring His existence from the things that are made?

Mr. Coleridge's Trinity is no other than his idea of God in *three different aspects*, or as exerting the three attributes, of will, reason and love. Thus, he says: "The distinctive title of the Father, as the supreme will, is *the Good*; that of the only begotten Word, as the supreme reason, is *the*

---

* Aids, pp. 142, 308. † *Ibid.*, pp. 110, 111.

True; and the Spirit, proceeding from the Good, through the True, is *the Wisdom.*" Again, he says, more expressly: "The Trinity is, first, *the Will;* secondly, *the Reason, or Word;* and thirdly, *the Love, or Life.* As we distinguish these, so we must unite them, as one God."* Is this the Christian doctrine of the Trinity? Or is it a specious form of Sabellianism, *alias* Unitarianism?

We come now to Mr. Coleridge's doctrine of *the Will,* which his followers regard as the key to his whole system. That he not only rejects, but grossly misrepresents, President Edwards' doctrine of the will, is certain. "The doctrine of modern Calvinism," says he, "as laid down by Jonathan Edwards, which represents a will absolutely passive—clay in the hands of the potter—destroys all will; takes away its essence and definition, as effectually, as in saying, 'This circle is a square,' I should deny the figure to be a circle at all."† The most charitable conclusion is, that Coleridge had never read Edwards on the will, and knew nothing about it, except from its enemies. For, if he had read it and understood it, he could not have so grossly misrepresented it. Does Edwards make the human "will absolutely passive—clay in the hands of the potter?" No man ever urged more forcibly than he the unembarrassed freedom of the will, or vindicated it more successfully.

As might be expected, from the above statement, Mr. Coleridge holds to the *self-determining power* of the will, and that in its most offensive form. The will, he says, "*Originates* its own acts, or is the cause of its own state;" else it is not a will. "This is the essential character by which will is opposed to nature, and is raised above nature; its power of originating an act or state." "The will is ultimately self-determined, or it is no longer a will under the law of perfect freedom, but a nature under the mechanism of cause and effect."‡

---

* Table Talk, vol. 1, p. 99. † Aids, p. 206. ‡ *Ib.*, pp. 263, 272, 285.

And yet, after all these high-sounding statements as to the self-sovereignty and independence of the human will, they have no application, on the theory of Coleridge, to human beings in their natural state. For we are a fallen race of creatures, and by the fall have utterly destroyed our freedom, and can hardly be said to have any will left. We have "received a nature into our will," and so come "under the mechanism of cause and effect." By his fall, says Mr. Coleridge, expressly, man "receives a nature into his will," and "a nature in a will is as inconsistent with freedom, as a free choice is with an incapacity of choosing aught but evil." It follows, therefore, notwithstanding all that has been said about self-determination, that there is no freedom in this fallen world, unless it be among the regenerate, and it can hardly be said to have an existence there. The depraved human will is utterly bound and helpless, and has no freedom except to do evil.

Mr. Coleridge has much to say of *original sin;* but by original sin he means, not the sin of our first parents, nor any thing which has come to us in consequence of their sin, but it is, to each individual, *his own first transgression.* Every one commits original sin for himself, and so plunges himself into the state above described. He thus "receives a nature into his will," after which he has no liberty except to do evil. But why it is that all men, from the first, *commit* original sin, and so plunge themselves, one after another, into this deplorable condition, Mr. Coleridge does not inform us.

Mr. Coleridge's doctrine of *regeneration,* in which he supposes the whole of redemption to consist, will be readily inferred from the foregoing statements. "A spiritual *seed* is impregnated and evolved—the germinant principle of spiritual life." It is the work of an Agent, who can at once act *on* the will, as an exciting cause, and *in* the will, as the condition of its potential, and the ground of its actual,

being."* Regeneration, according to Mr. Coleridge's principles, is the raising of a man from a state of hopeless, helpless bondage, to one of comparative liberty. It is the giving back to him of free will, after it had been by his own act destroyed. The subject of it can have no responsibility in regard to it, except to rejoice in the gift when it is bestowed, and endeavor, henceforward, to use it properly.

I said that regeneration, as above described, is, with Mr. Coleridge, the whole of redemption; since he not only ignores, but utterly *rejects*, the doctrine of atonement by the death of Christ. He regards all those Scriptures in which this great doctrine is set forth, much after the manner of modern Unitarians—as *figurative*. They merely denote, under a variety of high-wrought, Oriental imagery, *recovery from sin*. "Is it possible," he asks, "to assent to the doctrine of redemption, as at present promulgated, that the death of an unoffending being should be a consequence of the trangression of humanity, and its atonement?" As much as to say, that such an assent is impossible. Accordingly, his editor adds, in a note upon this passage: "Such were the opinions which Mr. Coleridge ever expressed to me; and they are to be taken as evidence, not of doubt, but of *disbelief*, in the corruptions of the vulgar Christianity in vogue," *i. e.*, in the atonement.†

It may moderate our surprise that Mr. Coleridge should have rejected the doctrine of atonement, when we learn that he scouted the idea of God's having any *right of property* in creatures, or any *right of dominion* over them. "What is this," he asks, "but flying to the old supralapsarian blasphemy, of a right of property in God over all his creatures, and destroying that sacred distinction between person and thing, which is the right and the life of all law, human and divine? Right of dominion, nonsense! Things are not objects of right and wrong. *Power* of dominion I

* Aids, pp. 194, 318. † Letters, p. 116.

understand, and right of *judgment* I understand; but right of dominion can have no immediate, but only a relative sense. I have a right of dominion over this estate, that is, relatively to all other persons. But, if there be a right of dominion over rational and free agents, then why blame Calvin? For all attributes are then merged in blind power, and God and fate are the same."*

If Mr. Coleridge believed as he here wrote, we do not wonder that he rejected the doctrine of atonement. If God has no right of dominion over His rational creatures, then He has no right to institute a government over them. He has no right to give them laws, or claim their obedience, or punish them for disobedience. His whole attempt to act as a moral governor is a usurpation, and all necessity for an atonement is taken way.

Among other essential doctrines which Mr. Coleridge rejected, was that of *the inspiration* of the Scriptures. On this point, he accepted the loose and dangerous positions of Eichorn. He denounced the common veneration for the letter of Scripture as *bibliolatry*.

Mr. Coleridge had no faith in the Scripture account of *the origin and apostasy of our race.* The Adam and Eve of Genesis he regarded as mythical personages, and the first chapters of the Bible as an instructive allegory. "No unprejudiced man can doubt," says he, "that if, in any other work of Eastern origin, he should meet with trees of life and of knowledge, or with talking and conversible snakes, he ought to regard it as an allegory he was reading, and intended to be understood as such."†

Mr. Coleridge taught that men would have needed a Christ, an incarnate Divinity, even though they had never sinned. "Man must have had a Christ," says he, "even if Adam had continued in Paradise; if, indeed, the history of

* Lit. Remains, vol. 3, pp. 330, 331. † Aids, p. 267.

Adam be not a myth."* The reason he assigns is, that otherwise God had been "but an ether, or gravitation," and we could have formed no idea of His personality.

Like most of the Germans, Mr. Coleridge denied that we have any scriptural authority for *infant baptism*, though he regarded the observance of it as suitable and useful. "The texts appealed to, as commanding or authorizing infant baptism, are all, without an exception, made to bear a sense neither contained nor deducible; and there exists no sufficient positive evidence, that the baptism of infants was instituted by the Apostles, or was practiced in the Apostolic age."†

Among other strange ideas, Mr. Coleridge insisted that "if human nature would make itself sinless and perfect, *it would become, or pass into, God.* Or, if God should abstract from human nature all imperfection, it might, without impropriety, be affirmed, even as Scripture doth affirm, that human nature is God."‡ If this be true, then the spirits of the just made perfect in heaven either become so many gods, or, losing their individuality, they are absorbed—swallowed up, in the sense of the Pantheists—in the great ocean of being out of which they came. It is said, in the above extract, that the Scriptures affirm as much as this. We wish Mr. Coleridge had given us the chapter and verse.

But we will not pursue the vagaries of this bewildered and eccentric genius further. That he *was* a genius, and that, too, of an high order, there can be no doubt. That his pages abound with the flashes, the coruscations of genius, all who have studied them will agree. And it is chiefly on account of these that he is worthy to be studied, and is so much admired. His thoughts often are striking and suggestive. They may well be entitled "Aids to Reflection." Nor would we deny that Mr. Coleridge has some *sensible*

---

* Lit. Remains, vol. 3, p. 319.

† Aids, p. 337.

‡ Lit. Remains, vol. 3, p. 79.

thoughts. Some of the essential truths of morality and religion he inculcated in an original and forcible manner. In particular, his refutation of the Paleyan utilitarian theory of virtue is complete.*

But his style is one of the worst conceivable, and consistency of thought he never aimed at; or, if such were his aims, it is certain that they were not realized. He knew not how to connect one thing with another, and consequently ran into perpetual inconsistencies. For example, his doctrine of the will would naturally lead to the boldest Pelagianism; and yet he insisted on the fallen, ruined state of man by nature, and on the necessity of the direct interposition of Divine power in order to his recovery. He discarded what he called the Necessitarianism of Edwards, and yet, without seeming to know it, he advanced the same thing. "The elements of necessity and free will are united," he says, "in the higher power of an omnipotent Providence, which *predestinates the whole*, in *the moral freedom of the integral parts*. It is God every where, and all creatures conform to his decrees; the righteous by performance of the law; the disobedient by the sufferance of the penalty."† Again. Mr. Coleridge represents obedience as following from faith and love, by "*that moral necessity*, which is *the highest form of freedom*."‡ If Mr. Coleridge had carefully examined Edwards, he would have found that he contended for no other than a *moral necessity* in the acts of the will, and that this was "the highest form of freedom." That view of the will which admits of its becoming so enslaved to evil, or so attempered to goodness, as to sin or obey, by a moral necessity, which is compatible with a predestinating Providence, to whose decrees "all creatures conform," is quite as high a style of Necessitarianism as has ever found favor among reputable Calvinists.

---

* See Friend, Ess. 11.

† Statesman's Manual, p. 42.

‡ Aids, p. 185.

But we stop here. We cannot pursue the subject further. We would not dissuade from the reading of Coleridge, if he be read with caution, discrimination, and prayer. But to accept of him as a guide, either in thought or expression, in style or system, in morals, metaphysics, or religion, is what we can neither do ourselves, nor recommend to others. We would as soon think of following a *Will-o'-the-Wisp*, or a *Jack-o'-Lantern.*

ARTICLE III.

FEMALE EDUCATION.*

Youth is universally and rightly regarded as the most critical period of human life. But I think many go too far in regarding youth as, beyond all others, the period in which the character for good or bad is formed; and for this reason, early childhood is too apt to be neglected. My own belief is, that character, in all its main points, is already formed before youth—that youth is the period, not so much of the formation, as of the developement, of character—that the seeds, whether good or bad, are planted in very early childhood, yea, even commencing within the first year, but remain more or less dormant until youth; when, feeling the warmth of passion, and illuminated by the light of reason, they expand into leaf, flower and fruit, filling the air with

* This article was delivered as an Address at the Annual Commencement of the Laurensville Female College, in this State. It appears on our pages as a further exposition of the writer's views on the subject of education, which he partly unfolded in two previous numbers of our journal. See Vol. XII., p. 310; and Vol. XIII., p. 39.—[Eds. S. P. R.]

fragrance and beauty, or poisoning it with noxious odors. Youth is, then, the critical period—the period which developes character—which shows of what stuff we are made. Every parent, therefore, watches with trembling anxiety the period of youth, because the period of planting is passing away for ever, and the period of fruition is commencing; the period of plasticity—of moulding influence, is not yet gone, but rapidly going, and the process of setting into comparative rigidity and permanence of form has begun. We must wait now, not idly, true, but in much anxiety, to see what is the result of all our labor and pains. When we recollect, then, the moulding influence of *woman* on the plastic mind of childhood—when we reflect that the character of every one of us has been in a great measure formed at our mother's knee—when we reflect, further, that the influence of woman is not confined to this most important period, but mingles with every phase of human life, and permeates every fibre of human society—when we see how the rudeness of the young man is subdued, his character elevated and refined, by contact with pure-minded, cultivated women—how the coarse jest and the vulgar oath is exchanged for expressions of noble sentiment; and, more than all, when we reflect, when we feel and know that, next to the love of God, the noblest, the purest, the holiest feeling of which our fallen human nature is capable, is the ardent and virtuous love of a noble woman—when we feel, as every manly heart must feel, the thousand ways in which woman influences human society for good—the holy influences which ever attend her steps, like nymphs which attend the steps of the chaste Diana—when we feel and reflect upon all this, surely it will be superfluous to say any thing on the importance of female education—the importance of training woman to fill the glorious sphere which Providence has assigned her. A noble, cultivated woman! ah! who is worthy to speak her praise? Let not folly, with its simper-

ing flatteries and affected gallantries, dare attempt it. Even wisdom approaches with mute admiration and holy fear.

Leaving aside, then, as self-evident, the transcendent *importance* of female education, let us attempt to explain its *principles*—let us endeavor to show in what consists its distinguishing characteristics. Now, as the object of all education is not to change, destroy or distort our nature, but to develop it to the fullest in its normal direction—not to fit us for impossible spheres of activity, but for that sphere of activity to which our natures have been adapted by Providence—it is evident that *the distinctive character of female education must find its basis in the distinctive nature and sphere of woman.* Our first object, therefore, will be to show, as briefly as possible, what *is* the distinctive nature and sphere of woman.

Within the last twenty or thirty years, there has commenced and rapidly developed, particularly in sections of our own country, a movement, called "the woman's-rights movement," the ostensible object of which is to assert the dignity of the female sex. Its watchword is equality of the sexes in mind, character, dignity, rights, and sphere of activity—meaning by equality, identity. Not content with her own distinctive character and sphere of activity, woman, it seems, would invade and appropriate that of man also. Like "Bottom, the weaver," in the play of "Midsummer Night's Dream," she would undertake to play all parts at the same time. She would play not only the lover's part —"the true performance" of which "asks abundance of tears"—but her "chief humor is the Ercles vein; a part to tear a cat in, to make all split." Not content with the lady's part, she would have the lion's part also. Thank Heaven, her roaring, however terrific it may be in certain sections of our country, with us at least is any thing but lion-like. In our own Sunny South, at least, she "aggravates her voice so," that she "roars as gently as any sucking dove," and "as sweetly as any nightingale;" and, best of all, her own

sweet face, with merry eyes twinkling with jest, peers out from beneath the lion's skin, and "so puts us out of fear." But, to be serious: the tendency of this movement is to assimilate the male and female character, the male and female spheres of activity, and the male and female education. The madness, the frenzy, the absurdity of this spirit has not touched us here at the South. Woman has not unsexed herself here by invading the sphere and donning the habiliments of man; but, nevertheless, we have not entirely escaped the mania. With us it has taken the higher, nobler form of female education. It displays itself in modifying somewhat our female education, assimilating it more to the male. Now, in so far as this has resulted in elevating the standard of female education, and in making it more solid and thorough, (as I believe it has,) I rejoice in it—I hail it as the promise of a glorious future; but in so far as it turns female education from its legitimate direction, (and this I believe it also has in some degree,) it can not be productive of any thing but harm.

I seldom or never hear the intellectual equality of the sexes either maintained or denied, without a certain feeling of sadness. It may seem strange to some, but every attempt I have ever heard to assert the dignity of woman, has tended to degrade her instead. The whole spirit of the argument generally shows, on both sides, an entire misconception of the true character, and an entire want of appreciation of the true glory, of woman. The whole argument proceeds upon a palpably false premise, and one, too, in the last degree degrading to the female sex, viz: that there is but one standard of human excellence—one ideal of humanity, and that is the male standard. To this standard, therefore, the female mind and character must be brought. On this Procrustes bed her tender limbs must be stretched. Is it surprising that the unnatural experiment fails? Is it surprising that, measured by this standard, the female falls below the male? Is not the very fact of such an experiment—

of such a comparison—the strongest proof that the female character is not understood? The fact is, there is a female as well as a male standard of excellence; and these two are in some degree distinct, and can not be compared. They are the necessary counterparts and complements of each other, and all comparison is unjust to the one or the other, according as one or the other is taken as the standard of comparison. It seems to me that the essential difference between man and woman, in their whole natures, is perfectly illustrated by bodily conformation, and is summed up in the two words—Strength and Beauty. The essential characteristic of man—that which constitutes his manhood—is Strength, bodily, intellectual and moral (the last two being, of course, by far the most important constituents of manhood); while the essential characteristic of woman—that which constitutes her womanhood—is Beauty and Grace; Beauty of person, of mind and of character, refinement, modesty, purity; in a word, all that ineffable grace which floats like an aroma about the person of a refined, pure-minded woman, and which, like a halo of glory, shrouds her from vulgar gaze and unholy thoughts. Beauty of person and refinement of mind and heart may and do infinitely adorn and elevate a man, but do not make him man. So, if to the essentially womanly characteristics of beauty, grace, refinement, modesty, purity and tenderness, there be added some thing of strength of intellect, power of will and physical courage, it may dignify, but can not make, the woman. No amount of refinement and tenderness can redeem the character of a man in whom the essentially manly characteristic of strength is wanting; and no amount of strong-mindedness can compensate in woman for the want of the true feminine virtues of grace, modesty and purity. The absurdity and injustice of the usual comparisons between man and woman, as if they were competitors for the same prize, is, then, perfectly evident. Suppose one should seriously start the question, as to whether the male or female body is

most perfect—most elevated in the scale of organization; do we not see at once the absurdity of the comparison? So much clearer is our perception of things material than of things spiritual. In such a comparison, if we make the male body the standard of comparison, *i. e.*, if we compare them in strength only, of course there is no doubt about the superiority of the male; but if we compare them as to beauty and grace, then the superiority is as evidently on the other side. So, also, if we compare male and female intellect or moral nature, as regards simple strength, then there can be no doubt of the superiority of the male; but compared in respect to quickness, dexterity, and a certain graceful movement of the mind, and, above all, in refinement, purity, tenderness and gentleness of heart, how infinitely is the superiority on the other side.

The very existence of this dispute—the very existence of the so-called woman's-rights movement—proves, no doubt, that woman is not yet completely appreciated—that amid much gallantry, chivalry and pretended, or, at least superficial, admiration for the sex, deep in the very centre of the heart there is a general feeling of the inferiority of woman—that we admit their superiority in some respects, as we admit the superiority of children in innocence and purity. Our very gallantry and chivalry is but the generous sentiment of a superior nature towards an inferior. I believe the complete equality of the sexes, though admitted at once as almost self-evident, is not yet fully realized and acted upon. Like many important truths in religion and morals, we assent to it at once, as a matter of course, and yet daily act as if we believed the contrary. It is intellectual assent without faith. In most men there is a secret assumption of superiority, even in the midst of the most profuse gallantries; in most women a tacit admission of inferiority, even when she most stoutly defends her sex from that charge. But, while I believe that woman has not yet been exalted to her true position as the equal companion of man, yet I am equally,

yea, much more certain that woman's-rights women, more than all others, mistake the true dignity of their sex—that all their efforts tend to degrade instead of to elevate the sex, by ignoring the essential distinction, bodily, intellectual and moral, between the two, and by making the masculine standard the single standard for both. We are apt to think that this woman's-rights mania has not invaded us here at the South; but it is visible here also, although we are certainly free from its worst ravages. In fact, it is one of the legitimate and necessary results of the philosophy of the last century, culminating in the French revolution—a philosophy which, pushed to its extreme, destroys distinctions of every kind; overthrows every relation of society, that of the ruler to the ruled, the master to the servant, parent to child, and, in the universal overthrow, destroys, as far as possible, even the distinction and the relation of the sexes. The effect of this spirit has been, to some extent, every where, to assimilate the male and female standard of excellence in every respect—among others, to assimilate the male and female standard of education. Now, I am as perfectly sure as I can be of any thing, that female education can never be improved by assimilating it to the male. But of this we shall speak more fully presently.

If woman is not to be elevated by woman's rights—by contending with man for the palm of victory in man's own field, whether of education or of activity; then how is she to be elevated? Evidently, by a more thorough appreciation and a more genuine and sincere admiration of her essential nature; and this can, I believe, only be accomplished by a more thorough and cordial appreciation of Art and of the precepts of Religion—a more heartfelt admiration of the Beautiful and the *Pure*. For further light on this subject, let us turn to the history of the influence of woman, and the causes of its steady progress.

In every thing human, there are distinguishable two elements which may be called masculine and feminine. The

one is variously called strength, power, energy, expression, life; the other delicacy, refinement, grace, beauty, harmony, purity. In character, the two elements are strength and refinement. In art, they are expression and harmony. In history, they are progression and conservatism. They may be briefly called the element of Power and the element of Beauty. Now, it is the natural tendency of the human mind to place the element of Power above the element of Beauty, as an abstract principle. In the earliest and rudest conditions of humanity, Power only is admired, and that, too, in its grossest form, as physical strength, and man is admired in proportion to his bodily strength and physical courage. Hence, the heroes and gods of this period are Giants and Titans. As civilization advances, the element of Power still holds its ascendency, but is now most admired in the higher form of intellectual and moral power. This it is which makes Milton's Satan so universally admired as a hero, even by those who are loth to confess their admiration; it is "the unconquerable will, the courage never to submit or yield," even though united with "immortal hate and study of revenge." Is it possible that in either of these periods, under either of these circumstances, woman could occupy any but an inferior position? Surely not. A passing admiration she might extort through man's sensuous nature, an homage rather degrading than elevating; but the higher homage of the intellect and the heart, she could not attain. In the mean time, in proportion as civilization and refinement increased—in proportion as more leisure, more thoughtfulness, more repose of mind, prevailed, the subtler and less imposing element of Beauty received a gradually increasing share of attention and admiration. But has it yet received a fully equal share of admiration? Is there not in the masses, and even in the most cultivated minds, a fuller and heartier admiration of Strength and Power, in the abstract, than of the opposite principle? I am compelled to think that there is. There is some thing in Power which

imposes upon and compels admiration under all circumstances and without reflection. On the contrary, the element of Harmony or Beauty is less gross, less conspicuous, less imposing. It does not *compel*, but *attracts*, admiration. The mind must be attuned—the heart must be prepared—or no note in the soul vibrates in unison with it. The admiration for Power is more intense, more constant, more universal; that for Beauty is weaker, more rare and occasional. Is not even this an evidence that this last is the higher feeling? Alas! for our poor human nature, it is our lower and grosser feelings which are also most intense, constant and universal. Our highest and purest emotions are also weakest and most occasional. The former abide with us, and often become our masters; the latter are occasional visitors, which must be hospitably entertained and tenderly nurtured and strengthened, that they may come oftener and abide longer. We must purify and "sanctify our souls as temples, and then only will the angels of noble thoughts not disdain to appear in them."

It will be admitted by all that Christianity has done more to elevate woman than all mere human institutions put together. But how has it done so? Obviously by insisting upon the intrinsic dignity of the essentially feminine virtues —by teaching that gentleness, meekness, goodness, tenderness, in a word, Beauty, is intrinsically as noble and as worthy to be admired as Power and Courage. The spirit of the old world taught, blessed are the strong, the proud, the self-reliant. The spirit of the new era teaches, blessed are the poor in spirit, the meek, the pure in heart. But this doctrine of Christianity, though universally acknowledged, is not yet felt with the whole heart. Until it is completely realized, woman can never take her true position as the entirely equal companion of man.

This general want of appreciation of the true dignity of woman, is not by any means confined to man, but is, I think, still more common among women themselves. Some

factitious creature of fashion, modelled by society, is too apt to be the beau-ideal of woman among women; or else, spurning so frivolous and hollow an ideal, she is apt to run to the other extreme, and take the ideal of man as the ideal of woman also. I know nothing more important, and yet more rare among women, than a true appreciation of woman. Even when the true ideal is presented, it is, most likely, repudiated as unnatural and unfeminine, because, foorsooth, unconventional. Alas! how little of independent taste there is in this world, especially among women. Beauty is not recognized as beauty, unless dressed in fashion. Grace, delicacy, feminine beauty of character, is not recognized as such, unless clothed in conventional proprieties. It is only on this principle that I can understand the general want of appreciation of the exquisite, the matchless women of Shakespeare. It is only on this principle that I can understand how it is that young ladies and gentlemen will weep in transports of admiration over the female characters of second-class novels, while Imogen, Miranda, Cordelia, Portia and Desdemona are neglected. Oh! let me entreat you, young ladies, to study earnestly the women of Shakespeare. Oh! that I could express one-tenth part the admiration I feel for these exquisite productions, or one-hundredth part the benefit I have received from admiring, reverencing, loving them. I can not even think of them without being purified and elevated—without feeling every generous and chivalric sentiment stirred within me—without offering the sincerest homage of my intellect and heart—the homage of deep reverence and fervent love. To Shakespeare, the female sex owe a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid, except by unbounded admiration. It is a remarkable fact, that no where among the exquisite productions of ancient genius, do we find any thing even approaching our modern idea of woman; for this idea was born of Christianity. Even among Christian writers, the natural embodiment of woman's character in its higher

phases, is found only is Shakespeare. Others, such as Walter Scott, have drawn women to the life—natural women—women such as we might hope to find and know in this world; but Shakespeare alone, of all writers, ancient or modern, has given us women, at the same time perfectly natural and attaining the most perfect ideal. Shakespeare alone, among all writers, ancient or modern, has held up to our view the feminine ideal as a thing not only to be loved and admired, but to be reverenced, yea, I had almost said to be worshipped. It has been said by some critic, that Shakespeare's genius was too bold, vigorous and masculine, to succeed well in his female characters. Whoever made this remark was intent only on saying some thing striking, but had no just appreciation of Shakespeare's genius. Delicacy, subtleness, electrical swiftness and energy were distinguishing characteristics of Shakespeare, even more than massive power. I have no hesitancy in asserting that among all his characters, his women are his master-pieces. His men were blocked out with comparative ease, with heavy but sure blows, which never missed their aim a hair's breadth; but his women, ah! on these he has delighted to linger; these he has finished with the most delicate touches; in these even the microscopic power of the most refined criticism tries in vain to follow the exquisite touches of his chisel.

Before taking leave of this subject, I can not help speaking of and earnestly recommending the admirable criticisms of Shakespeare's female characters, by Mrs. Jameson. It seems to me that, next to Shakespeare, Mrs. Jameson's "Characteristics of Women" contains the truest conception of female character; and that, therefore, this work is really the finest criticism of Shakespeare's women that exists in any language. I do believe that of all female writers, Mrs. Jameson is the most truly feminine, and therefore that one of which the sex has most reason to be proud. I do not believe any young woman can read, carefully and thought-

fully, the writings of this authoress, without being elevated and purified—without receiving a higher and truer conception of the character of woman.

I have thus attempted to show the essential difference, and yet equal dignity, of the masculine and feminine ideal. Let us next compare their spheres of activity. Even here, the tendency of the age has been to assimilate; but in this case the absurdity of the assimilation is so obvious, that there can be no difference of opinion. The invasion of the sphere of man by woman, or *vice versa*, is looked upon with disgust or ridicule by every well-constituted mind. I think, however, that there is, nevertheless, a secret feeling of self-gratulation almost universal among men, and of humiliation among women, on comparing these two spheres of activity as to their respective dignity. There is, I think, an almost universal feeling, undefined or unexpressed, perhaps, but none the less real, that man has been blessed with the higher, broader, nobler and more dignified sphere of activity—the sphere which calls out to a greater extent the higher faculties of the mind. Now, I think that if the previous point, viz: the essential difference, yet equal dignity, of the masculine and feminine character is clearly apprehended, the question of comparative dignity of their respective spheres of activity is already answered; for there can be no doubt that the spheres are exactly suited to the corresponding characters, and severally adapted to cultivate them to the highest degree. But, perhaps I can make this point still plainer—perhaps I can still farther vindicate the character and the sphere of woman from the charge of inferiority, by placing the subject in another point of view.

It is true that man's sphere is the great public world, and woman's the narrower and more private world of home. It is true that the infinitely diversified operations of the State, the Church, and the still more diversified operations of industry, belong to man, while woman is confined to the one function of government of the household. It is true

that the sphere of man, *in the abstract, i. e.*, of all men, is wider, more comprehensive, more diversified, and requiring more varied talent, than the sphere of woman in the abstract. Yes, in the *abstract*, but how is it in the *concrete?* How is it in the individual man and woman? Is not the advantage on the other side? Man's sphere is, indeed, great and noble, varied, immensely broad; but, alas! it is divided into a thousand petty domains by division of labor, and each man occupies but one. Woman's sphere is, indeed, narrower; but every woman occupies the whole. Is not, then, the sphere of the individual man often much narrower than that of the individual woman? Is not the management of a household and the education of children, a nobler and wider sphere of activity than that of most trades and professions of man? Thus it is seen that woman's sphere, though more confined, is really what its name indicates, *a sphere*, perfect and complete in itself; while the field of activity of each individual man is but a mis-shapen *fragment* of a great sphere. Now we find, as we might expect, a corresponding effect upon the male and female character. The division and sub-division of labor in the sphere of man, by confining the intellectual and moral energies within the limits of a single trade or profession, miserably distorts and contracts the spiritual nature of man. In proportion as division of labor increases—in proportion as competition is more severe, and the struggle for life more intense, in the same proportion the whole mind and sympathies become more and more absorbed within the narrower and still narrower limits of each particular trade or pursuit. Thus, with advancing civilization, the field of each man becomes narrower and narrower, the struggle and competition becomes more and more severe, the absorption of the mind becomes more and more complete, the character becomes more and more distorted and fragmentary, until often the only salvation of the man is the influence of Home and the family circle; in other

words, contact with the purer and more perfect sphere of woman. Oh! who has not felt that his spiritual nature is daily strengthened, and his moral, independent dignity vindicated, by this contact? Who has not felt that but for this, he would become a mere drudge, a slave, a senseless wheel in the complex machinery of society! Thus, even though we admitted the superiority of the *ideal man* over the *ideal woman*, we would still have to admit that the *actual* man falls below the actual woman. The actual man, from the very nature of his field of activity, is generally one-sided and fragmentary. To make the *ideal man*, we would have to combine together many *actual men;* but the ideal woman is almost attained in the actual. It is a remark of the poet, Pope, that "most women have no characters at all." This remark, which was intended as the most biting satire, is certainly true in one sense; but in the sense in which it is true, it contains the highest possible compliment to woman. Remarkable men have generally been one-sided men. Men become remarkable by the inordinate developement of some peculiarity or faculty, generally to the detriment of other faculties. Their natures, from the fact of being fragmentary, are angular. It is these very angles and depressions which constitute the distinctive individual characters of *most men.* But women, on the contrary, from the completeness and absence of division of their sphere of activity, are more complete and symmetrical in their developement—less angular, and, therefore, less distinctive. Thus, the individual differences among men are more striking, and stand out in bolder relief; but the reason of this is their greater departure from the ideal. Thus, in nature we may possibly find some approach to the ideal woman; but we look in vain for any approach to the ideal man. In Shakespeare, too, we find the most perfect embodiment of the ideal woman which art has produced, but no where any attempt at the ideal in man. Shakespeare

well knew that such an attempt would be vain, because the result would be unnatural.

Having thus spoken of the distinctive nature and sphere of woman as compared with man, and since the object of education is to develop our nature and prepare us for our peculiar spheres of activity, we are now in a condition to speak of the distinctive character of female education.

As there is a common humanity which underlies all sexual distinctions, so there are common and universal principles of education based upon this common humanity. But as this common humanity is modified by sex, to a degree which it is the tendency of the age to overlook, so, also, the universal principles of education must be modified according to sex, to an extent which it is the fashion of the times to ignore. Again, as the characters of the two sexes, commencing in infancy from an almost common point, gradually diverge, until they reach their greatest point of difference in mature age, so, also, the education of the two sexes, similar at first, must gradually diverge, as their natures do, until the difference culminates in active life. It is principally, therefore, the latter portion of the educational life of which I shall speak, since in this part only its distinctive character should be prominent.

1st. It will be admitted by all that there are two distinct kinds of education, or modes of teaching, viz: the formal and the informal. The one is the communication of knowledge by formal rules and didactic methods; the other is the moulding of the character, feelings, tastes and moral nature, by daily contact, informal conversation and example. Now, of these two, the informal education is evidently of the most transcendent importance. In the simple departments of pure knowledge, where the intellect alone is involved, we may teach by formal rules and by strict methods. We understand clearly what we are doing, and the best mode of doing it—we can measure accurately the exact amount of knowledge communicated from teacher to pupil;

but in the higher departments of knowledge, and still more in the formation of character and tastes, where the emotions are involved as well as the intellect—the heart as well as the head—it is impossible to teach entirely in this manner. We can not analyze and understand the process of teaching. We can not always teach only so much, and what we like. We can not say, thus far will we teach and no farther. In a word, it is no longer formal teaching alone. It is the silent, involuntary, often unconscious, communication of the habits, tastes, feelings, in short, of the whole spirit of the teacher to the pupil. The formal method may be compared to the construction of an edifice, in which we proceed by square and level, adding stone to stone, and marking at every step the exact amount of progress; the informal education is rather the silent growth of a living germ planted and daily nurtured in the heart, to blossom and bear fruit in after life. It is true that the first is generally considered characteristic of school education, while the latter belongs peculiarly to home education; but it is evident, I think, that the two kinds should be combined, only in different proportions, both at home and at school. It is certain that the moulding influence of familiar contact with higher and nobler natures should not be neglected in school education.

Now, the first characteristic of female education upon which I would insist is, the predominance, at all times, both at home and at school, of this silent moulding influence—this informal teaching. As important as this is in all education, I am convinced that it is still more important in female than in male education. I believe so, because, from the very nature of the female mind, it is more susceptible of indirect teaching, and less susceptible of formal, didatic teaching, than the male. Woman's character and woman's mind is certainly more plastic—more easily influenced and moulded, less proud, self-reliant and self-poised than man's. I have said that the distinguishing

characteristics of man are Strength and Courage; and of woman, Beauty, Purity. I now go farther, and say that these characteristics are perfectly adapted to their respective spheres—that the only safety of man, in his contact with the world, is *strength*, intellectual and moral; while the safety of woman is her *purity*. Man's sphere is the great public world. He must of necessity come in contact with vice and temptation in every form. His whole safety depends upon his strength and courage to fight the battle of life—upon his intellectual and moral power to resist and beat back temptation. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that this power of resistance should be educated, by allowing a gradually increasing freedom, and thus cultivating the capacity of self-government. The boy of necessity passes from the private life of the family to the public life of the world—from parental influence and parental guidance to self-government and self-direction amid the infinitely diversified temptations of the world. If this change takes place suddenly—if up to the age of twenty-one the young man has been entirely under parental influence and parental guidance, and then is suddenly launched upon the sea of life, without having practiced his limbs in buffeting its waves, or his intellect in guiding his bark, either he is quickly lost, or else, lacking boldness to venture his unpracticed bark on so dangerous a sea, he contents himself with a timid and fearful *coasting*. Alas! his coasting should have been in boyhood. The illimitable sea is the province of manhood. Boyhood is the period in which alone difficult arts can be learned to perfection. He will strive in vain now to acquire skill and courage. He has missed the golden opportunity; he has failed to take the tide at its flood. Like Rasselas, he may be immured until maturity in never-so-beautiful a valley, surrounded by the warmest hearts, and every desire gratified, except the inextinguishable longing for the outer world; but when he escapes, the glowing vision of this outer world

will change into a terrible reality of struggle and conflict, for which he is totally unfit by previous preparation. Thus, I believe, some latitude, some freedom, some contact with the world, is important for the boy, while still under parental control and guidance, in order that self-reliance, self-control, self-government may be practiced under the eye of the parent, and thus danger be avoided. In one word, the boy must be taught to walk alone, intellectually and morally, as well as physically, and somewhat in the same manner. He must first be held constantly by the hand; he must then be allowed to go a little way alone, but not beyond the eye of the watchful parent, lest serious, perhaps fatal, injury befall him; then he must be allowed to rove far away, still followed by parental counsel; until, finally, he has learned to take care of himself, and the parental influence is no longer necessary. Woman, on the other hand, never passes from the private to the public life. She seldom walks alone, but leaning on the arm of another. She remains in port, while man battles with the storms of life. Man's safety, the integrity of his character and the maintenance of his virtue, is mainly dependent upon his strength and courage. Woman's safety and virtue, on the other hand, is mainly dependent upon her *purity*. Man must meet vice and overcome it. Woman shrinks instinctively from it, for to her even its contact is pollution. For this reason, therefore—a reason which is based in her distinctive character and sphere—woman's education should be more monastic than man's. For this reason, the character, moral and religious, the tastes, feelings, habits, etc., of her teachers, are even more important than their attainments. For this reason, the intercourse between teacher and pupil should be more familiar than it is generally in male schools and colleges. Parental influence, rather than rigid law, should reign in the school.

It is instructive to observe how these two systems of education—these two methods of forming character—the

one adapted to the developement of strength, and the other the maintenance of purity, is illustrated in every family, showing that they are based not only in reason, but in the truest instincts of our nature. As might be supposed, the father is the advocate of the former, and the mother of the latter. The father's motto is, "Nothing is learned without experience—nothing is accomplished without venturing." The mother's motto is, "Keep out of harm's way—do not venture until you learn—do not go into the water until you learn to swim." The father's idea of education is, to place the child under favorable conditions, plant the seeds of virtue, and allow him to develop himself. The mother's idea is, to leave nothing to chance, nor even to self-developement; but rather to mould the character according to a preconceived ideal. Now, both these systems are undoubtedly right—they must be and are combined in every family, but in different proportions, according to the sex; the former predominating in the education of the boys, the latter in that of the girls.

You will, I am sure, pardon me another illustration of the same truth, taken from the Dramas of Shakespeare; even though it may have no other merit than as a criticism on the great bard. In the infinite multitude of criticisms on Shakespeare, it may seem impossible to say, or even presumptuous to attempt, any thing new; but I am sure every appreciating mind and feeling heart knows that the glory of Shakespeare is like the glory of Solomon, "the half has not been told us." I have already said that no writer of any time understood female character as did Shakespeare. Nothing shows this more wonderfully than the difference in the manner in which he treats the two sexes—a difference founded in the deepest knowledge of the characteristics of the two, and therefore in strict consonance with a sound education in each case. I do not, for a moment, suppose that Shakespeare had any philosophic views on the subject; but it only shows how the

intuitions of genius are confirmed by a rational philosophy. There are two methods of teaching by example, whether in the world or in its transcript, the Drama. First, by the exhibition of a strong, noble nature, struggling manfully, but finally overcome and ruined by temptation; second, by the exhibition of elevation and purity of character almost unapproachable by temptation. In the first, we are repelled by the deformity, the ugliness, of vice, or shrink back, appalled by its fearful consequences even in the noblest natures; in the second, we are attracted towards virtue by its intrinsic loveliness. In the first, we are conducted, like Dante, through the infernal regions of vice, and view with horror the tortures of evil passion; in the second, fixing our eyes steadily upon ideal Beauty, like Dante gazing into the eyes of Beatrice, we are drawn upward in ecstasy to the seventh heaven. Now, in his male characters Shakespeare uses the one method, and in his female characters the other; and thus, to the appreciative mind, the Dramas of Shakespeare become more moral than all formal moral treatises put together. In Shakespeare we find man in struggle with vice—in conflict with evil passion. The great dramatist holds up to our view a strong, noble nature, like Macbeth or Othello, but marred, as we all are more or less, by some evil passion, as ambition or jealousy. We see this noble nature in a moment of weakness yielding to temptation and becoming the slave of passion. Then comes the terrible struggle with the consequences. In this struggle the man is beaten at every step; his character gradually undermined, demoralized and ruined, as the necessary consequence of the first act of weakness. Is not this a spectacle, of all others, the most moral to the thoughtful mind? But how differently does he treat woman! Such a spectacle of woman struggling unavailingly with vice, gradually demoralized and ruined, would be not only shocking to our taste, but could not be in any way improving. On the contrary, he draws

the character of woman in its ideal beauty and perfection, full of innocence and purity, an object to be loved and reverenced, an example to draw us to virtue. Man, he depicts in desperate contest with vice and evil passion, finally overwhelmed and ruined; woman, in contest with misfortune, overwhelmed, perhaps, but unsullied, and even purified. In the one case he teaches the necessity of active strength and courage; in the other, of passive strength and fortitude, and, more than all, of that beauty of soul, that harmony of spirit, which is unassailable alike by misfortune or by evil passion. Even Lady Macbeth is no exception, but a confirmation of the rule. She participates in her husband's first crime—true—but to have represented her undergoing a process of demoralization similar to that of her husband, would have been utterly unartistic, because contrary to nature. Man goes down step by step, fighting at every step; the very existence of the fight showing the possibility of victory, or at least offering a sublime spectacle of manly courage. Woman, when she stoops to crime, when once she yields to evil passion, when once the purity of her soul is sullied by vice, gives up the contest, and succumbs at once. Either she becomes utterly depraved, or else, if of nobler nature, shrinks back aghast at the fearful consequences—the endless succession of crimes entailed—succumbs, and dies crazed or broken-hearted. Thus, the character of Lady Macbeth is not merely coarse, vulgar and fierce, as generally conceived, but thoroughly womanly.

Thus, the nature of woman, the instincts of parental government, and the intuitions of genius, all admonish us to guard well the beauty and purity of female character—all teach us that in the education of woman the maintenance of Purity is even more important than the development of Strength.

2d. The second characteristic of female education is one which I am sure will astonish many. It is that *woman's*

education may be made more practical than man's—that the utilitarian idea may be introduced, and even made prominent, without the bad effects which are sure to attend the introduction of this idea into the elementary education of the male sex. The reason of this difference is the fact to which I have already called attention, viz: that the sphere of *woman is one, perfect and undivided*, while that of *man is infinitely sub-divided.* The narrowing, contracting, distorting effect upon the nature of man of this excessive sub-division, I have already spoken of above, and more fully in my address "on the principles of a liberal education." All who are engrossed in active life, must feel and deplore it. But if this idea is carried into education also—if boys are educated for particular trades and professions from early childhood—in a word, if education is made but an apprenticeship to active or business life, then the effects upon the mind and character become disastrous in the extreme—then schools and colleges become manufactories where business men are made—where each individual human soul, the image of God, is hewed and sawed, or filed and hammered, until it fits a particular place in the great machine called human society. The beauty, the symmetry, the completeness of manhood is gone; a miserable fragment of humanity—a senseless wheel in the complex machinery of society—is all that is left. I have striven to show, in the address just alluded to, that the educational life is not an apprenticeship, but the complement of the business or active life—that education should strive, as far as possible, to counteract the distorting effects of active life—that in proportion as active life tends to narrow, sharpen and contract, education should strive to expand and give symmetry—in proportion as the one tends to the special, the other should tend to the general. The whole idea there conveyed may be condensed into the single proposition, that it is the object of education to fit each man for the *sphere of man in the abstract, i. e.*, for the whole

sphere of man, and not for any sub-division of that sphere which the necessities of material existence may compel him to choose. Thus, a liberal education forms a broad common basis of sympathy between men of all classes and pursuits. Thus, we see the very great importance of carefully excluding the utilitarian idea from a course of liberal education, of the male sex. But this danger does not exist in female education, because the sphere of woman is not thus sub-divided. To educate a woman for the practical duties of life, is to educate her, to some extent, for the whole sphere of woman. Surely, it can never injure a girl—but, on the contrary, it will be of the greatest possible benefit to mind and character—to serve an apprenticeship, even from earliest childhood, to the most practical household duties. In the male sex, there is a sort of antagonism between the educational and practical life, as also between the world of thought and the world of reality. In the female sex, these two are beautifully and harmoniously blended together, so that it is difficult to separate them. It is true, that this practical education—this apprenticeship to the practical duties of life—is best undertaken at home, and therefore it may be unnecessary to introduce it into school education. All I wish to insist on is the fact that thorough, practical education, whether at home or at school, can never produce any other than good effects upon the mind and character of woman.

3d. I come now to the last, most difficult, and perhaps the most important point connected with female education: How should the ordinary curriculum of didactic teaching be modified for the female sex? What should be the difference between the male and female curriculum? I have little doubt that there will be much difference of opinion on this point; but it seems to me that the view which I am about to present, follows legitimately and necessarily from the view of female character and woman's sphere already

presented. If we admit the one, we must admit the other also.

To those who have read my address, already referred to, "on the principles of a liberal education," I could make my views intelligible in a very few words. But, as I have no right to suppose that many, if any, of my audience have had either opportunity or disposition to do so, I am compelled very briefly to recapitulate one of its leading ideas, referring you to the address itself for a fuller statement.

In this address, then, I endeavored to show that in every complete course of education, there are three, and but three, subordinate courses, viz: the Scientific course, the Philosophic course, and the Art course. The first commences with Mathematics, and, passing upwards through Mechanical, Physical and Chemical Sciences, finishes with Organic Science and Geology. The second commences with Logic, and passes upwards through Psychology, Metaphysics and Theology. The third commences with Classics as its base, passes upwards through Modern Languages, Literature and Art, (including Composition, Rhetoric, etc.,) and finishes with History. I have attempted, moreover, to show that each of these courses is by itself incomplete—that the three are complementary to one another, and only in their union constitute a complete course of education, and produce symmetry of mental developement. Thus, a complete course of education may be compared to a magnificent building, composed primarily of three subordinate buildings, viz: a centre building and two wings, each in some sense complete in itself, but all much more complete in their union. This I conceive to be the ideal of human education. But as the common humanity is modified by sex, so must this ideal of human education be modified according to the sex to be educated. In other words, in both male and female education, the educational structure consists equally of centre building and two wings; but the department which constitutes the main building must be

different. It may be a matter of doubt which of the three courses should be predominant in male education—whether, *e. g.*, Science or Philosophy should constitute the centre building; but in female education, it seems to me, there is no room for doubt. *In female education, the Art course must for ever constitute the main building.*

The third characteristic of female education, then, upon which I would insist is, *the predominance of the Art course.* The ideal of female education, as I believe, consists in a thoroughly complete Art course, supported on the one side by sufficient culture in mathematics and physical science—on the other by sufficient training in logic and metaphysics, to maintain the symmetry of the mind. Do not mistake me as advocating the neglect of other departments, and particularly of science. On the contrary, I look upon the physical and natural sciences as being peculiarly adapted to stimulate activity and awaken inquiry in all minds. All of these are, beyond question, necessary, but I must think that the largest share of time and attention should be given to the Art course. If any must be sacrificed, in part or wholly, let it not be this. In order to show this more clearly, let us again compare the two sexes. I have already compared them as to character. I wish now to compare them as to their purely intellectual faculties. I will not say, as some have done, that man is a more rational being than woman; but I do say that the reason of man is *more formal*—that the mind of man, whether in the discovery, or the communication, or the reception, of truth, *proceeds more according to regular rule, distinct process and methods*—rules which may be understood, processes which may be taught, and methods which may be practiced. The education of man, therefore, must consist, in a large measure, in the clear apprehension and the dextrous use of these methods, *e. g.*, the method of induction, the method of deduction, and all the sub-divisions of these, *e. g.*, the method of notation, the method of experiment, the method of comparison, etc.

The mind of woman, on the contrary, rapidly discovers, communicates and receives truth by processes which, by their subtleness, escape analysis. The mind of *man creeps* from point to point, linking one proposition to another, in an unbroken chain of induction or deduction. The mind of *woman leaps* from premise to conclusion, often with wonderful clearness and precision, disdaining the intermediate links by which these distant points are connected. In man we have the predominance of the *formal* reason; in woman, of the *intuitive* reason.

Now, if the distinctive feature of the female character and mind is such as I have attempted to show, the peculiar adaptedness of the Art course to the cultivation of her mind becomes at once evident. Of the three courses I have already spoken of, as together constituting a complete education, the scientific and the philosophic make most constant use of regular methods. It is impossible to make progress in these except by the strictest use of severe methods. These, therefore, are admirably adapted to the cultivation of the *formal* reason, so characteristic of the male mind. In the Art course, on the contrary, the methods and processes are less rigid, formal, and severe. In fact, much of this course may be best taught without method. This course, therefore, is peculiarly adapted to the cultivation of the *intuitive or informal* reason, so characteristic of the female sex. "The sense of an expression in a foreign language is both a grammatical and an intellectual problem; this problem is suited to the comprehension of every pupil. At first he understands only the words; then he ascends to the conception of the phrase, finally to the charm of the expression, its force and harmony." When we have attained the signification of the words, and have a perfect knowledge of the grammar of the phrase, we are then conscious of an intellectual process which has been called "guessing," but which is rather a rapid process of comparison and combination—in other words, a rapid process of reasoning, so rapid

that the separate steps are lost—by which we arrive at the meaning of the author. Having obtained the thought, there still remains the task of embodying it in appropriate and graceful form of our own. Thus, the study of language cultivates, to a remarkable degree, the memory, the perceptive faculties or intuitive reason, the imagination, and the power of expression, or the power of turning thought into appropriate language. Are not these the most important faculties in the mental character of woman? Quickness of intuitive perception, a rapid arriving at correct conclusions by processes which she does not care to analyze, a warm imagination, and a power of ready, graceful, easy expression—ah! who can resist the charm of these in woman!

Language, then, as the most fundamental of human Arts, forms the natural basis of the entire Art course. But, in order that this basis be broadly and firmly laid, the Language course should commence with the Classics. The great importance of the Classics in a course of language, both as a means of mental culture and as a basis of sound knowledge in modern, and even in our own language, I have already insisted on in the address so often alluded to. It would take me too far to discuss the subject here. Suffice it to say, that Classics is equally important in female as in male education. I believe that one of the most important defects of our female education, is the general neglect of Ancient Languages. The study of these would, I am persuaded, give an entirely different significance to the whole Art course. It would be viewed less in the light of mere *accomplishment*, and more in the light of *mental culture*.

And now, need I say any thing of *Art* proper? Purity, grace, harmony, in a word, Beauty, is the distinguishing characteristic of woman, the brightest gem in her crown of glory, and Art is confessedly the embodiment of Beauty. The highest evidence of female culture, I believe, is a deep,

pervading, sincere love of *Art.* We are unconsciously assimilated more or less to whatever we sincerely love, admire and reverence. A sincere love of Beauty, ideal and high, generates beauty of character and purity of soul, especially in the plastic nature of woman. There may be such a thing as a radical discordance in the nature of man —as the simultaneous existence in the same mind of the most opposite and irreconcilable principles, motives, feelings; like Lawrence Sterne, he may be capable of the purest sentiments and the noblest feelings, and yet live the most flagitious life—may be the devout worshipper of the most beautiful ideal, and yet the slave of the lowest passions; but I do not believe this anomaly is possible in woman. *Her* heart and intellect is cultivated, *her* character elevated and purified, even *her person* beautified, to an inconceivable degree, through her tastes, her sentiments, her imagination. But if the *love and appreciation* of Art cultivates the imagination, the taste, the sense of beauty, *the practice of Art*, in addition to these, cultivates, also, like language, the perceptive faculties and power of expression. Indeed, language is but the most primitive and universal Art, and Art is but a refined species of language. They are both but different methods of embodying thought and feeling. Thus, then, in woman I would have cultivated, not only the love of Art, but the practice of Art—not only the appreciation of Literature, but the practice of Composition. This last, viz: the practice of Composition, I conceive to be of the very greatest importance.

But it will no doubt be objected by some, possibly by many, that education in the Art course—acquaintance with languages, music, drawing, and the like, and practice in the art of composition—does very well in its place as a finishing off; but these, after all, are but accomplishments, and such education only superficial—that the so-called *solid branches* should predominate and form the ground-work of every education. The objection is founded in an entire

misconception of the object and function of the Art course, if not of education itself. The very words, "finishing off," "accomplishments," "solid branches," prove it. All branches are equally solid when pursued in the right spirit, and the whole idea of finishing off, and of accomplishments, should be banished from our schemes of education. No one can despise more heartily than I do mere accomplishments. No one can contemn more thoroughly the wasting of time and talent, the frittering away the depth and earnestness of the character, in learning arts and languages merely for the purpose of shining in and imposing upon society—the pursuit of education for mere purposes of vanity, instead of a sincere love of truth and beauty, and a sincere desire to ennoble and purify our nature. Alas! that the noble cause of education should ever be made to pander to the miserable vanities of society. To get a smattering of several modern languages by committing phrases to memory—to learn to finger dextrously on the piano even the immortal works of great composers—which even to approach without mental preparation is sacrilege—while the mind is engaged in frivolous vanities; to learn to manipulate the crayon rapidly and dextrously with conventional touches in copying the works of third-rate copyists, while the glory, the beauty, the holiness of Nature stir no emotion in the breast; to practice the pen in the manufacture of jingling verses, which come not from the heart, but full of borrowed sentiment and affectation; alas! of all vanities with which our poor human nature is afflicted, surely this is one of the most utterly light and frivolous. I admit, at once, that of all education this is the most superficial. But, on the contrary, to have grasped the spirit and genius of any language, so that its best literature is thrown open to us; to have succeeded, by the study and practice of music, in strengthening and cultivating the love of harmony and song, latent within the soul; to have learned, through our sincere, though humble, and perhaps

unsuccessful efforts, to imitate the forms and colors of nature, to see a richer glory in those colors and a higher beauty in those forms, and thus to love nature with a purer and holier love; to have our taste directed, and our love stimulated, in the higher walks of poetry, until the great old bards, becoming our constant companions, shall guide our steps into higher and purer regions of thought; perhaps, above all, to have practiced the noble art of composition until every thought awakened in the soul, by Nature or Art, shall find expression in noble, melodious language; every sentiment flitting like summer cloud across the pure heaven of the female mind, shall bless mortals with its shadow of appropriate expression; every tender emotion nestling timidly in the soft bosom of woman, concealed from mortal ken, may, when necessary, reveal its holy presence in fitting words of sympathy and love; every fancy, even the lightest, most graceful and delicate, floating like gossamer in the warm sunshine of woman's imagination, invisible to mortal eyes, shall sparkle in the rich drapery of gorgeous expression, like the same gossamer sparkling with morning dew. Surely, this is an education any thing but superficial—surely, this is *the* education which most fits a woman not only to fill, but to adorn, the sphere to which she is called. Recollect, that the principal object of the study of Art is not to make artists, but to *cultivate the love of beauty*, and thus to open to the soul the treasures of Art and the glories of Nature—to remove the scales from the mind's eye, that every thing beautiful may be mirrored in the soul—to unstop the deaf ear, that it may hear the music of the spheres. If the pupil acquires proficiency in the Art itself, and continues to practice it through life, so much the better. But if household cares, the stern duties, anxieties and responsibilities of life, compel her to give it up, her time has not, therefore, been lost. Far from it. Her nature has been beautified, refined and spiritualized; the treasure-house of beauty has been

opened to her, never to be closed again; the divine harmony of the universe has struck a responsive chord in her soul, which will vibrate with deeper and deeper music through eternity. The harmony within will diffuse itself outward, creating happiness and communicating refinement to her household. Yes, the sense of beauty, like the principle of Love, is never lost; the object may be lost, but the living principle remains. A new nature is born within us, which is immortal. But oh! let us not commit the fatal error of mistaking accomplishments for true Art. The sense of Beauty is the soul of Art, as Love is the soul of Courtesy, and Faith the soul of Religion. But Art, like Religion, in fact, like every thing great and noble in this world, has its counterfeit, in which we have the *form only*, but no living soul. *Accomplishments are but the form of Art, without the soul.* Art, without a deep sense of beauty, like artificial courtesy without love or kindness, or works without faith, is utterly worthless and dead.

I have insisted thus strongly on a thorough Art course, and, at the same time, have attempted to indicate its true nature and dignity, in order to guard against two prevailing and oposite errors. The first is the degradation of the Art course into a mere school of accomplishments, in which the very purposes of education, and even the dignity and destiny of the human soul, is lost sight of in the frivolous vanities of an artificial society. This is, beyond all doubt, the worst possible education—perhaps worse than no education at all. It is, in fact, the introduction into education of the utilitarian spirit in its worst form, since it makes education subservient, if not to the vanities and frivolities, at least to the amusements and recreations, instead of the duties and responsibilities, of life. It destroys the whole dignity and seriousness of female life, and degrades woman into a mere trifler, by making fashionable society, instead of home, her true sphere. The second is a violent reaction against the mere vanity and absurdity of the other. It is

an attempt to elevate the standard of female education by assimilating it to the male. The tendency of this error is to introduce the severer and more masculine studies of mathematics and science, on the one hand, and of logic and metaphysics, on the other, to the at least partial exclusion, and generally to the complete mutilation, of the Art course, degrading it to a position of secondary importance. They say our daughters shall have as good education as our sons—meaning thereby the same education. The defenders of this system are really earnest, sincere men, but somewhat too practical, if not material, minded. They feel deeply the frivolousness of mere accomplishments, but do not appreciate the dignity of true *Art.* They appreciate woman in the capacity of a thrifty housekeeper, affectionate wife and mother, ever watchful, ever busy; but do not appreciate her glorious mission of refining, elevating and ennobling the human race—do not perceive that in the performance of simple household duties in her humble, circumscribed sphere, and in her quiet, unobtrusive way, the truly noble and cultivated woman is performing the greatest work with which mortals are intrusted here below. Yes, the noble, cultivated, refined woman, by mere presence and contact—by the exhibition of noble virtues and elevated tastes, is moulding, unconsciously, perhaps, to herself and to them, but still moulding, purifying the character and cultivating the minds of her children, her husband, and all with whom she comes in contact. And yet so quiet, so unobtrusive is this influence, that it is only perceived by philosophy, unless revealed by love. And she, the magician who works these miracles—she, occupied with her own quiet duties and the tender, self-sacrificing promptings of her own heart, walks amid the happy world she has created, all unconscious of her own greatness.

ARTICLE IV.

THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.*

IV. The Scriptures declare the three persons of the Trinity to be equal in all that constitutes God.

We proceed to remark, as a fourth proposition deduced from the teaching of Scripture, that these three persons are equal in all that constitutes God. We assume, as undoubted by any one, and as agreeable both to reason and to revelation, that there are attributes and operations (or by whatever more suitable term we may designate them,) which are peculiar and essential to the Deity; such as creative and preserving power, absolute prescience, moral sovereignty, and the like. These are necessarily included in our notion of the incommunicable nature of God; "ever present, actively coöperating, and exerting their own distinguishing influence in all His laws, providences and acts. Thus, if God be eternal or omnipresent, we consider His

---

* We resume in this number, and shall complete (*D. V.*) in our next, this argument, which we commenced in No. 1, Vol. XI., and continued in No. 2 of the same volume, and resumed again in No. 2, Vol. XII. Circumstances which we could not control have hindered the progress of it until now. We state here, for the purpose of distinctly exhibiting the course of the argument, that it consists of five propositions, as follows:

I. The Scriptures teach that *God is one.*

II. The Scriptures teach that *the unity of the Godhead admits a plurality of persons.*

III. The Scriptures teach that *the distinctions in the Godhead are personal, not nominal.*

IV. The Scriptures teach that *the three persons of the Godhead are equal in all that constitutes God.*

V. The Scriptures teach that *the three Divine persons of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are not three Gods, and therefore that they are one God.*—[EDS. S. P. R.]

power, knowledge, and holiness to be coeternal and coextensive with Him. Moreover, it would be an absurdity to form a comparison between these and God Himself; to regard them as numerically distinct from Him; to investigate the particular mode of their existence in the Divine mind; or to treat them as parts of God, inasmuch as they are all included in the idea of the one indivisible Godhead." This, however, is not a matter of doubt or speculation, for we are most expressly assured that the blessed God has a name which He alone can possess,* and a glory which he will not give to another.† God, then, who is a jealous God, and whose name is jealous, must be characterized in His own Word by those titles, attributes and works, which are peculiar to His name and glory.

If, therefore, we find that in Scripture God ascribes to the Son and Spirit the very same names, and represents them as in all respects to be honored with the same glory, as that which is ascribed to the Father Himself, we surely must conclude that, however otherwise the Father and the Son and the Spirit are distinguished from each other, they are not three separate Gods—one supreme and two subordinate Gods—but that they must necessarily be one and the same God, in three persons—that is, a triunity of persons in one Godhead.

The Son of God, as mediator, and, therefore, as God manifest in the flesh, and the Spirit of God, as the attribute or agent of the Deity, might, indeed, have the name of God *figuratively* applied to them, and yet not be really God. But, while this is conceivable, it will be surely admitted that, in a book given to convey the only knowledge of God's nature which is possible to his creatures, such a figurative application of the title and glory of God would be so cautiously used, and so carefully guarded and explained, as to leave no doubt as to its real and figurative import.

---

* Ps. 83, 18. † Isa. 42, 8.

This, however, is very far from being the case. Throughout the Scriptures the names or titles appropriated to God—the attributes and works attributed only to the Supreme Being—and the divine worship, in which this God is reverentially and exclusively adored, are all ascribed to the Son and to the Spirit, as well as to the Father, and hence the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are in this way most unquestionably proved to be severally God, coequal, coexistent, and coeternal, in nature, power and glory.

The proof of this position we design to advance in a separate discussion of the supreme Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. At present, we assume that the proof is at hand, and we conclude that, as there is only one Godhead—as in this Godhead there is a plurality of persons—and as these persons are the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, that, therefore, these three are one. This doctrine is plain and comprehensible, as a fact revealed, but unsearchable and irreconcilable, as are many other primary and demonstrable truths.

This is a fact respecting the mysterious economy of the Divine nature, which the Divine wisdom has been pleased to reveal. As a fact, it is at once plain and indubitable. God, by revealing it as a fact, makes that plain to our comprehension, by the manifestation of its actual operation and practical effects, which, in its nature, is a mystery that ever has been, and ever must be, incomprehensible, and past our finding out.

St. Augustine determined to give three days and nights in succession to prayer and meditation, that he might understand the mystery of the Trinity. On the third night he was overcome with sleep, and dreamed he was walking on the sea-shore. There he saw a little child, who was scooping a hole in the sand, and filling it with sea-water from a shell. "What art thou doing, my child?" said the saint. "I am going," was the answer, "to put all the sea in this hole." "My child, you can never do

that," said Augustine. Then the child looked up, the Light of the world beaming from his divine eyes, and said, "I can do it, Augustine, as easily as thou canst comprehend the subject of thy thoughts." *

But the fact is neither incomprehensible nor "hard to be understood." All it requires, is the "obedience of faith," the acceptance of God's testimony, as the most infallible of all evidence. And, surely, there can be no excuse for hesitation in believing, as a fact, what is revealed and manifested in all the doctrines and duties, of which it is the foundation, when we are compelled to believe in the existence of our own mental and moral nature, while we have not even the consciousness of its existence, or of the existence of any one of its powers, except as they are manifested by their effects.†

It is precisely on the same ground we believe in the eternity of God, or His duration without beginning and without end; in the omniscience, in the omnipresence, in the providence, in the power and in the moral government, of God. These all surpass the power of the human mind to grasp them. In believing them as facts, it is unable to comprehend what it assents to, or to reconcile one with the other, in their apparently contradictory conclusions. The truths or facts are established by indisputable evidence, but their apparently contradictory principles and conclusions remain inexplicable. And this is true of all natural and revealed religious truths. When God is a term in any proposition, we can not reason—we can only listen and adore.

The necessity of believing as facts or truths what we can not comprehend in their nature or harmonize in their relations to one another, is not peculiar to these logical

---

* The visitor to the Vatican Palace, in Rome, will see this significant incident, designed by Raphael, on one of the panels of the famous picture, "Stanzas of Raphael."

† The mind and its powers are entirely out of consciousness, and only known by their effects.—*Sir Wm. Hamilton.*

truths. It is equally true of mathematical science, in which there are not a few propositions which are demonstrably certain, and yet, so far as reason can comprehend them, incredible, or impossible; and yet they are not only believed, but are made the foundation of other principles, and of incalculable results.

The same is true of natural science, also, in which such laws as gravitation, chemical and magnetic attraction, electricity, vegetable and animal life, etc., demand assent, while nothing is or can be known of their real nature. To carry out the principle on which Unitarianism rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, viz: That a man can not rationally believe any thing he can not understand, is both absurd and unphilosophical, and would reduce man to universal ignorance and idiotcy.*

ARTICLE V.

BUNSEN ON THE BIBLE.

Bunsen's Bibelwerk. Vollständiges Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. In drei Abtheilungen. Von Christian Carl Josias Bunsen. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus; 1858, 1859, 1860. Large 8vo., pp. cccxciv., 345, 826, 642.

The above is the general title of a work on the Scriptures, by the Chevalier Bunsen, designed for the people

* For to pretend to apply reason to subjects with regard to which our own short views, and even our experience, will shew us it can not be depended on, (and of such subjects he had before given, as examples, those of infinity, immensity and eternity, as ascribed to God,) this is vanity and conceit and unreasonableness.—*Butler's Anal. Pt.* 1, *ch. VI.*

speaking the German language, and embodying, for general use, what the distinguished author regarded as the main results of modern criticism. Germany, almost alone, he affirms, of all Christian nations, has, for nearly a hundred years, and especially since the commencement of this century, bestowed upon the Bible that thought and research which its own importance, and the love of truth, as well as the religious and moral wants of the present age, demand. The time, in his view, had now come, when the real results of Biblical Science should be submitted to the people in some intelligible form, as a precious, common treasure, which could not longer be withheld. It has been, he says, his life-long desire and labor to set the entire truth before the community of Christians, to the best of his knowledge, and in all fidelity, so that each part might contribute, systematically, to their information, and enable them to form their own individual judgments. This work the author proposed to bring forth in three divisions, the first to bear the title of the Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Covenant, translated according to the traditional text of the original, and accompanied by a popular exposition, and to embrace in its three Parts—I. The Law; II. The Prophets; III. The (didactic) Scriptures, with the Apocrypha; IV. The Scriptures of the New Covenant. The Translation of Luther, notwithstanding its high merits, is, in his view, no longer adequate. He aims to give another after the same noble model, but nearer the original text, and embodying, as far as practicable, the results of modern learning. The Second Division bears the title of *Bibelurkunden, oder Bibeltexte*, etc. The Bible Records, or The Biblical Text, historically arranged and explained. This, also, divides itself into three Parts, and embraces discussions respecting the origin and age of the original Text, and its authors and collectors. The Third Division, under the Title of *Bibelgeschichte*, or Bible History, is to comprehend, in one volume, The Everlasting Kingdom of

God and the Life of Jesus, embracing the great events and persons of the Old and New Covenant. This, also, falls into two sections: The Bible in the World-History, and the World-History in the Bible, the central point of the last being, the Life of Jesus. The whole work will be completed in eight volumes. The first two volumes of the First Division have reached us, embracing the Law, with a Prolegomena of cccxciv. pages, and the Prophets. Of the Second Division, we have received the first portion, which is numbered as the fifth volume, and contains the *Bibel-urkunden*, or Bible Records, with Essays on them, and an Atlas, prepared by the practiced hand of Dr. H. Lange, according to the latest and best authorities.

The Chevalier Bunsen has enjoyed a reputation, at home and abroad, for many years, both in the republic of letters and as the representative of Prussia at foreign courts. His early studies were chiefly philological, in which he enjoyed the instructions of Heyne and Heeren, at Göttingen, and subsequently of De Sacy and others in Oriental studies, at Paris. Having studied the Sanscrit, he conceived the idea of visiting India, but being disappointed in this, he went to Rome, became the secretary of Niebuhr, by whom his studies were in some manner directed, and whom he succeeded as minister at the Papal Court. The work which he there prepared, in connection with Platner and others, on the Antiquities of Rome, is an excellent and almost indispensable aid to him who would be acquainted with that city of ancient ruins, and would ascend to those early times in which their foundations were laid. It is specially rich in Christian antiquities, and his monograph on the ancient Basilicas is marked with an exhaustive fullness. In Rome he formed the acquaintance of Champollion the younger, and commenced with him the study of the Hieroglyphics. In 1838 he left Rome, and for many years was Prussian Ambassador at the Court of St. James, London. His attention being turned in two main directions

by these early studies, he produced two extensive works of antiquarian research, the first, "Hypolitus and his Age," which in the second edition reached to seven vols., 8vo., he having hung upon this text other broad and divergent discussions, as "The Philosophy of Language and Religion," in two octavos, and "Analecta Ante-Nicænæ," three volumes more. These volumes are marked with varied but ill-digested learning, and though they breathe a pious spirit, and are penetrated with admiration for the heroic past of the Church, disclose theological leanings which were greatly regretted by the friends of evangelical truth. The same remarks apply to his "*Egypten's Stelle, in der Weltgeschichte,*" * "Egypt's Place in Universal History," which was written partly at Rome, Munich and Berne, and revised and completed at London, where he enjoyed the aid of Birch and others, as he had done of Lepsius before. The English translation, by C. H. Cottrell, Esq., the first volume of which was published in 1848, and the fourth and last during the last year (1860), were prepared, to a great degree, under the author's inspection, and are, especially in the first three books, a great improvement on the German original. He has also published, recently, a large work, "God in History," in which he has reproduced the general views which he had given summarily in the "Hypolytus," before. In 1847 he published "The Constitution of the Church of the Future," the occasion of which was the establishment of the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric of Jerusalem. This half-Lutheran, half-Anglican establishment gave rise to much discussion, in which Gladstone, Dr. Arnold, and Bunsen took part. In this the German philosopher and statesman put forth many noble and just views in favor of the freedom of the congregation, as opposed to a clergy-Church, and some lofty anticipations in reference to the Church of the Future, vitiated, however, by the idea that

* Book I., published in 1843, Books II., III., in 1835.

the congregation is none other than the Christian nation, through whose chief magistrate the chief bishop is to receive his ultimate appointment; involving thus the vice of all European Church establishments, a dependence, more or less direct, of the ecclesiastical upon the civil power. His ideal of Church government would seem to have been a moderate Episcopacy, with large privileges accorded to the people. In 1856, after his retirement to his own country, he found time, amidst his labors upon the Biblical work whose title we have given, to write his "Signs of the Times," in which he took up arms against the bigotry of the old Lutheran party and Church despotism, in favor of what he regarded as religious freedom.

The author's own account of his preparation for the work now before us, leads him to rehearse several points of his personal history. He assures us that this is no accidental or recent project, but one arising out of a systematic plan and preparation for it. For fifty years the intellectual efforts of the author, he says, have been directed to investigations and thought, the conscious central point of which, for the last forty years, (from 1858,) has been more and more a work like this. No one can object to him that he approaches it without mature consideration. The convictions of a life-time, have a worth in themselves, if honorably gained, and subjected to conscientious proof; and at best, no one can do more than devote an entire life to a regular education for a scientific work. His attention, he tells us, was directed to Christ and the Scriptures by pious and experienced parents. In 1805, while at school, he read Genesis and the Gospels in the original, and the latter in Syriac in 1807, under a scholar of Michaelis. At the University, in 1808, whither he went for the study of theology, he had the good fortune, in his exegetical studies, to find in Arnold and Hartmann thorough teachers. In 1810 he applied himself to investigations in Classical Antiquities, not losing sight of Biblical research, to which he

intended to return. He rehearses the story of his seven years' academic course, begun at Marburg and pursued at Göttingen under Heyne, with Wilhelm Hey, Karl Lachmann and Friedrich Lücke as companions, substantially as we have before related; of his study of the Persic and Arabic at Paris, under the kind instructions of De Sacy, of his six years' friendly cohabitation at Rome with Niebuhr, the master of historical criticism, who frequently exhorted and encouraged him to carry out his critical labors upon the field of the Bible. He had already, in 1817, resumed his work, and made a public announcement of it at the Tricentenary of the Reformation, held that year. During the twenty-two years of his residence at Rome, he continued his Biblical researches on the central point of the whole, the life of Jesus. The first sketch of this and of the life of Paul was prepared in the years 1823—1834. He brought the whole together in the year 1835, in a complete criticism of the Gospels, the central point being the Gospel of John, as the work of an eye-witness. He then resumed the study of Genesis. In 1837 he translated the prophets Joel and Jonah, with a critical elaboration, which, in the year 1856, he allowed to be printed as a contribution to the work, "God in History." In 1842 he employed himself upon a translation of a selection of sixty Psalms, which appeared anonymously as an "Evangelical Hymn and Prayer Book," in 1846. In Rome, as well as in England, where he lived nearly fifteen years, as a man of letters and an ambassador, he had frequent occasion to know the inestimable worth and necessity of the Bible, and its use to a free people. In 1849 he finished, according to the sketch made in 1835, a complete harmony of the four Gospels, and the summer of the fatal year of 1850, he had the leisure and comfort of writing out the Life of Jesus, as he presents it to the public in his present work. In the summer of 1854, after forty years' absence from his native land, he obtained the leisure, for which he had long sought, of

bringing the present work to a termination, on which, however, he continued to bestow methodical labor, down to the period when its publication began. The experience of a long life, the fresh courage and undiminished mental vigor received from God, lead him to hope that it will be yielded to him in his gray old age to discharge the vow made in his youth. From his researches upon allied and neighboring domains, to which a translator and expounder of the Bible in this our day dare not be a stranger, he has laid before the German and English people, if he may venture thus to say, sufficient proof that he had not busied himself with this thing incidentally, as a make-shift, or from an incompetent amateurship.*

Such is the venerable author's own account of his preparation for the work now before us. The advantages he enjoyed were certainly such, in some particulars, as fall to the lot of comparatively few. And yet, for a translator of the Scriptures, and for an exegete, skillful and worthy of entire confidence, we would wish to be assured of other acquirements and convictions than this course of study and these aspirations necessarily imply. First of all, we would wish to be assured that the author relies with a simple faith on the Lord Jesus Christ as the only Saviour, as the Light of the world and the Life of men. Assured of this, we would wish to know if he holds the Scriptures as an inspired Revelation of the Will of God, an infallible rule of practice and of faith. We would value his conclusions far more, if we knew that his life had been spent in a careful study of the original Scriptures, till he had become familiar with every shade of doctrine, and every verbal idiom, than if we knew he had spent his days in decyphering the hieroglyphics of Egypt, in the baffling attempt to adjust the dynasties of Manetho, or in bringing forth the long buried writings of some ancient, almost

* Erster Halbband p. cxviii., *et seq.*

forgotten, Father of the Church, who apprehended but imperfectly those doctrines which look forth in the Scriptures with resplendent purity. Far rather would we have one trained in the believing school of the English Puritans, with the superaddition of all that is valuable in modern Biblical learning, than amid the destructive criticism of a Niebuhr, who believed in the Bible, probably, only as he did in any other book of high antiquity. Nor do we know in which department his labors were the greatest, whether in the pursuits of Biblical and antiquarian research, or in Diplomacy and Statesmanship. We give him all credit for noble aspirations, for varied and discursive learning, for a kind and genial nature, and for strong religious sensibilities, and for a hatred of all oppression; indeed, how could we withhold a just praise from one who called forth the glowing eulogies of Arnold; but not one nor all these things, of themselves, qualify one for so great and responsible a work as this distinguished scholar and diplomat has undertaken.

What were his views, for example, as to the plenary inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures? There are many expressions of the author which show, in various directions, a high valuation of the Bible as the Word of God. "Bible-Christians," says he, "have no longer to contend for the outworks, but for the very centre of the castle of their faith. Without, the unbelieving world buzzes around, and urges on with its surging violence, with its giddiness and lust for gold, while within, ferocious enemies advance from every side. Some German scholars have given forth the Gospel of testimony, the annunciation of the Word of Life, that which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, as a myth, an invention of the Gnostics. But it is an easy blindness, or a more bitter jeer, if men should now arise among ourselves, or elsewhere, who should make themselves or us believe that there could be any common Christianity more, after such an assumption. If the Gospel

of John is a myth, and no historic account, but a myth, then is there no historic Christ, and without a historic Christ is all popular faith in Christianity a delusion, all Christian profession hypocrisy or infatuation, the worship of God a juggle, and the Reformation a crime or a frenzy." "Over against these views stands the assault of a priestly party, with their claim to an absolute dominion over States and over the consciences of men, and their death-struggle against liberty and science, with deadly hate against the Bible. They tear the Word of God from the hands of the people, and burn faithful translations of it as the most pernicious of books. An evidence this of unmistakable unbelief; for whoever believes in the Bible, and the Spirit which inspired it, can neither hinder its diffusion nor bar the people from its investigation."*

He proposes to treat the Bible according to the strict demands of a devout but historical criticism. And though none can object to the just words which we have now quoted, his views of what a devout or believing, yet scientific, criticism is, may be very different from ours, and what the Church of God is willing to receive. "In such a treatment," he says, "we secure ourselves as much as possible against special disappointment on the soil, and as to the results, of critical science; but we also gain thereby an invincible weapon against the prejudices of unscientific and slow-minded men, and against the oracular decisions, whether of theologians or philosophers. Biblical historic science opposes not a child-like faith in the letter of the Bible, but protects this faith, while it purges it. It attacks its three enemies, who, to a certain extent, act under the same cover, though they apparently war with each other. These are, first, flat unbelief, or the absolute denial of any connection of historical tradition with our inner life; then its opposite, often its offspring, artful, outright bigotry, and

* Erster Band, p. x.

withdrawment of the word of the Scriptures; and, finally, that systematic tyranny which adorns itself with the name of the Bible, but in fact supplants it. All these three enemies the scientific investigation of the Bible did not bring into existence, but found already. This third enemy is the worst. We allude expressly to that mechanical idea of inspiration of the mediæval clergy-Church, increasing in many regions, strengthened by the dullness and bibliolatry of many theologians of the seventeenth century, and the ignorance of their successors in the nineteenth. Other opposers of Biblical faith incur the danger of treating the Bible as a legend, and rashly accusing it of self-contradictions. But only the mechanical idea of the Bible's inspiration makes the Bible, whether it will or nill, in historical things, a legend—in spiritual, a lie, and kills the life in both. It is necessary, throughout, in this department of Biblical inquiry to tear off from this spirit of darkness this angel-mask of faith, to wit: in the name of God's Word, and this can only be done hand in hand with true Bible-knowledge and historical criticism. And this must be done, not alone on account of the undeniable right of truth, but especially because that form of unbelief has disfigured the true evangelical faith in the Spirit of God (existing) in the Scriptures, and is now perplexing and unsettling many of the best and noblest minds."*

This is lofty language, and has in many respects the ring of genuine coin. But base metals, in this our day, are so skilfully compounded and concealed as to pass current with any but the most practiced assayers. "This mechanical idea of inspiration has no other notion," he says, "of the letter of the Bible, than the Hindoo has of his Vedas, the Mohammedan of his Koran, the obdurate Pharisee of his Law and Tradition, of his Thora or Masora. The Bible is to be regarded as a historical ground of faith, because

* Fünfter Band, 7–10.

it is some thing entirely different from the Vedas and Koran, and for this reason, is no Pharisaic Thora, because it assumes throughout, and plainly, the letter only as the expression of the Spirit, and the Spirit as working according to its own divine laws, upon the mind of honest, pious men, through their reason, and its conscientious application to the realities around them."

"Consider," says he, "only the contradictions of this system. According to it, the exalted heroes of faith and prophets, the divinely appointed champions of humanity, are not the objects of the working of this divine energy, but he who composed the books which tell of them. And where both coincide, as in the Apostolic epistles, it is again not the mind and heart of the man of God, which are moved by the breath of the Divine Spirit, but it is the tongue unconsciously speaking, and the finger writing involuntarily, that are the instruments God uses. That speaks, this writes what is suggested to the speaker or writer, without its proceeding from his inner life and its history. Thus they speak in languages they do not understand, and preach as God's Word that of which they know nothing. They are infallible in this speaking and writing, whether they announce their religious convictions, and speak of divine things, or of outward circumstances, things which have nothing to do with religion. The sun must go round the earth, if the passage seems to say so. 'What is written stands,' they cry, and none give themselves less trouble than they, to know what stands written. 'The letter is inspired,' that is their watch-word, and yet they make no effort to know what the letter really says!"*

Now, we do not know what this writer means by mechanical inspiration, unless he refers to the common idea of it, entertained by the truly evangelical Churches of Christendom. And he has no right to call this an assertion of

* Band, V., p. 8.

mechanical inspiration. The laws of matter are one thing. The laws of mind are another. The human agent, used by the Divine Author of the Scriptures, is a moral and intellectual agent, and not a machine, with joints and pullies, and nothing more. The lips and fingers do not move without the writer's own intelligent guidance. The product betrays his intellectual character, bears the marks of his previous education, and is imbued with his own genius. But there is another agent, one higher and Divine, whose heavenly inflence inter-penetrates all his powers, and acts upon them and in them. The product partakes of the character of both agents. The words are the words of men, and they are, at the same time, the infallible Word of God, who can not lie. The exalted heroes of faith, the divinely appointed champions of humanity, the Joshuas, the Gideons, the Davids, were moved by God to act, and directed in their action; but the writer who recorded their exploits or their errors, was also inspired to write them, and the Scripture that he thus wrote is the product of this inspiration, is itself the inspired Word of the Almighty, or is to us no infallible rule of faith and duty. Inspiration is analogous to the work of divine, efficacious grace upon the heart. In this "God does all, and we do all." And yet, it has its own specific differences. The Holy Spirit must have impelled the sacred penmen to write, must have revealed to them the truths to be recorded, or brought to their recollection what had been revealed to them before, must have been with them in the selection of that which was either already a matter of human record, or was attainable by their natural powers, and must have continued with them, aiding and guiding, till that which was to be spoken was uttered, and that which was to be written was traced on the parchment before them. It is in reference to these very Scriptures of which Bunsen, in what is now before us, chiefly speaks, that the Apostle says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and Peter declares that

"Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved, (φερόμενοι, *borne on*) by the Holy Ghost."

We can not make the language and the assumptions of this writer consistent with any just conception of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

His view as to the origin of Genesis, is as follows: He rejects the theory which has now but few advocates, that the account of the creation, fall, confusion of tongues, etc., is a pure fiction. The disclosures of Comparative Philology have taught us the perfect historical truth of the account of the dispersion and derivation of nations, which it gives us. He rejects the mythic hypothesis, according to which, it is a detail of distorted and very early recitals of astronomical and philosophical myths. "The mythic notion has had its sway, like an infectious disease, for two generations, and has led many intellectual and learned men to the verge of madness." He maintains that an actual reality lies at the bottom of all that is said about the primeval world, whether it be in the territory of the *ideal*, or strictly historical. Yet, that we can not demand of the late compiler what we would of an original eye-witness. It will not only be lawful, therefore, but obligatory to distinguish between his subjective views and the objective matters of fact. This he maintains he can do without calling in question the writer's capacity to bring in a trustworthy report. "Wherever there is an honest and pious mind, there is inspiration." "Inspiration is in the Scriptures, because it is in the Church." *

In Abraham we have an entirely historic character, who lived in the historic times of Asia and of Egypt, who cast off the fetters of the degrading superstition which surrounded him in Mesopotamia and Canaan, and raised himself, and mankind with him, to a consciousness of the

* Band, V., pp. 11–18.

Eternal. Migrating from the Aramæan soil, he brought with him the traditions of the region whence he came, which had been preserved in his own family, and transmitted them to his immediate descendants in Canaan, the dialect of which country he now adopted. The history of the creation is compiled from two ancient narratives. The first, in which the name of God is Elohim, is the oldest and most historic, and is from a Semitic source; the other, in which the name of God is Jehovah, is more philosophical, is used by the compiler of the book of Genesis to supplement the first, is more in the spirit of the Israelitish people, and originated probably in the times of Moses.

These traditions were at the latest written down by Moses, and in the times of Hezekiah were placed at the commencement of the narrative of the beginning of that people. The traditions of the antediluvian times were handed down by Abraham from an Aramæan source. The history of the creation is ideal, and the days of creation are not natural days, yet in the general succession of events there is a striking correspondence between it and the requirements of the nebular hypothesis of La Place, and the general results of geological research. The flood was local, confined to the central parts of Asia, which, before this catastrophe, were exceedingly fertile, though now waste. The Egyptian people passed over from the region of the Euphrates to the valley of the Nile before this event, indeed, some eleven thousand years before Christ, and retained no traditions of a deluge.* The ages of the antediluvian patriarchs are not historic, but are to be judged of according to the general method resorted to in adjusting oral traditions.

Some of the views of this writer on this and the kindred subjects of chronology are most extraordinary. Here, and in his book, "Egypt's Place in Universal History,"† he

* Band, V., pp. 19–35, 61, 62.

† Vol. IV., B. V., Part V., pp. 385–402.

considers that there is a double list of the antediluvian patriarchs. That which is commonly supposed to give the descendants of Adam through Cain, is only another form of that which gives his descendants through Seth. The latter came from an Aramæan source, the other from a Canaanitish. The so-called antediluvian generations are so many cycles, at the head of which the several persons, if persons they are, whose names are mentioned, stood as landmarks in the course of time. Very strangely, he considers the Seth of the one to be the same with the Jehovah Elohim of the other, and the Adam of one to be the same as the Enos of the other, for no other reason, that we can see, than because he has found Set as the name of a God in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and because both Adam and Enosh, in the Hebrew, are names for man, and, in his view, are here the name, not of an individual, but of mankind. So the four hundred and thirty-eight years of Arphaksad, after the flood, is simply the time of the residence of Shem's, descendants in Arapakitis, and the four hundred and thirty-three years of Selah (Mission) is the period in which the race pushed forward their settlements. Only gradually did this number pass into the date of individual persons. These things belong to the ideal, rather than to the historic, just as the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil also do. We desire to know nothing of mystic numbers, whether they be astronomical or theosophico-cabalistic. We dare not come to the honest historical inquirer with facts which oppose natural science or philosophy. We leave to dogmatic Church theologians the sorry privilege of treating the Biblical narratives as if they were fables."

Others must judge whether this, or the theory that the duration of human life was reduced after the flood, is the true one—whether this or that is most consistent with what claims to be the Word of God. As we proceed upward from our own date, till we reach the period of

Abraham, we find the generations as they now are, and find him lamenting that his days were few and evil, and reached not unto the days of the years of his fathers. An evidence, this, if these narratives are in any way historic, that old age had come on Abraham far earlier than upon the generations that preceded him. And Bunsen fully admits that this Abraham lived in the strictly historic period.

But it is necessary that we possess ourselves of the chronological system which Bunsen advocates, that we may be able to conjecture the length of way these traditions, according to his scheme, have travelled. We find him, by means of the dynasties of Manetho, which Champollion, Wilkinson, Roscellini, Seyffarth, Nolan, Osburn, Prof. Rask, and Poole, bring into consistency with the Biblical chronology, placing Menes, the first historic king, often identified with Mizraim, three thousand six hundred and twenty-three years before Christ, or one thousand three hundred and thirty-three years before the Hebrew, and six hundred and twenty-five years before the Septuagint date of the deluge. The period of hereditary kings in Lower Egypt, ascends to 5414, B. C., of elective kings to 7230, B. C., or three thousand one hundred and twenty-nine years before the Mosaic date of Adam's creation. The birth of Abraham, he places in the year, 2927 B. C. In 2900, B. C., this patriarch withdraws, with his father, Terah, to the south-western part of Mesopotamia; in 2867, B. C., he migrates to Canaan. In the last half of the same century, his venerable form was seen at the court of the Pharaohs, where he appeared as the prudent Semite, the cautious husband of the beautiful Sarai, where he beheld the massive pyramids, some of which were erected five hundred years before, and witnessed those religious rites, which must have filled him with horror. Nearly half-way between Abraham and Christ, he places Moses and the exode, dating this in the year 1320, nearly two hundred

years later than the ordinary computation, and making the interval between Abraham and Moses one thousand five hundred years, instead of the three hundred and thirty which the Scriptures seem to give.

If we are surprised at this, we may look into his "Egypt's Place in Universal History," * and behold the *aliquid immensum infinitumque*, with which this wonderful chronologist is all the while in travail. There we shall find "that the flood of Noah can not have taken place later than about ten thousand years before Christ, and could not have taken place much earlier," and that man existed upon the earth at least ten thousand years before that, or twenty thousand years before Christ. He assumes, in the first place, contrary to the tenor of the Scriptures, that the earliest state of man was that of barbarism. From the rise of the Romance languages of Southern Europe he learns that it requires five hundred years, or fifteen generations, for new languages to be formed. Again, he argues that it requires, in like manner, long periods for the various systems of Pagan religion to arise. The chapter on this subject is a wonderful specimen of German mist, "a darkness which might be felt." The results to which he comes are these: That in the first five thousand years of the world's history Primitive Language was formed, which was spoken with a rising or falling cadence; elucidated by gesture; accompanied by pure pictorial writing; every syllable a word, every word a substantive, representable by a picture. This language was deposited in Northern China, and Sinism arose. Religious conscience was polarized. Objective worship was addressed to the firmament, and subjective worship to the souls of parents. It was the manifestation of the divine in the family. Another thousand years passed away, and words were agglutinated, polysyllables were formed by unity of word-accent, particles

* Vol. IV., 475.

came into existence, and, finally, complete parts of speech. The germ of mythology was developed, language itself leading to it; the powers of nature became personified as divine forces. In the fourteenth millenium before Christ, stem words became roots, and derived words appeared. In the thirteenth, declension and conjugation, with affixes and suffixes, came into being. The twelfth brought symbolical hieroglyphics, representatives of ideas, without any phonetic element. Eleven thousand years before Christ, the phonetic element was introduced, and the ideo-graphic character was used to express a syllable, without reference to its original meaning. This stage of language in Egypt was owing to an immigration of West-Asiatic Shemites.

Behold the theory! Adam, of which Enos is the equivalent name, is humanity, and probably no person, though he is in the New Testament always spoken of as such, the head of the first covenant, as the personal Christ is of the second. The contest between Cain and Abel is there no contest, as Bunsen represents it, between the agriculturists and the shepherds, which lasted through a long cycle, but Abel is the man of faith, seeking expiation for sin, and offering a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, who had the religion only of nature. Enoch does not mark an epoch or cycle equalling the years ascribed to him, but is a man, the seventh in descent from Adam, who prophesied of the advent of the Lord. He admits this, but affirms that, even in the times of Solomon, the original traditions about Adam, Seth, Enos, Enoch, and others, had ceased to be understood. Language, too, in this theory, is a human invention, and not a divine endowment of the first man as he came perfect from the hand of his Creator. The idea of miracle in the confusion of tongues is indignantly rejected.* It is a providential event, interrupting the civil bond which united one common people. It is to be compared with that which gave

* Bibelwerk, V., 38.

rise to the five or six Romanic tongues, by the destruction of the Roman empire in Italy, France, Spain, and Wallacia. "The miracle of the confusion of tongues is an invention or myth of the moderns." The whole proceeds from the organism of man and the principle of development of the human mind. But, even if so, why these interminable ages for the formation of existing tongues. The substantial union of idioms which gave rise to the Romanic languages, must have been accomplished in one or two generations, for men who have always spoken, though it be different tongues, must continue to speak, and contrive to be understood. "The process of handing down languages through centuries, without break or loss," says Max Müller, an authority which Bunsen was wont to respect, "is possible only among people whose history runs on in one main stream. But no nucleus of society or civilization has ever been formed in the vast Turanian wildernesses. Empires were no sooner founded than they were scattered again, like the sand-clouds of the desert; no laws, no songs, no stories outlived the age of their authors. How quickly language can change if thus left to itself, without any standard, and kept up only by the daily wants of a savage life, may be seen by the endless variety of idioms in America, or on the borders of India, Thibet, and China. There it has happened that colonies from the same village, settled in neighboring vallies, have become mutually unintelligible after one or two generations. The peculiarities of a rising family may change the whole surface of a language, and the accent of a successful Khán may leave its stamp on the grammar of all the tribes that follow him. It is when a language is once fixed by literary works of a national character, that change becomes difficult, nay, impossible, without political convulsions." * The men of barbarous nations,

* Max Müller's Survey of Languages, pp. 87, 88, 93, 94. On the Turanian Languages.

while their languages were yet flexible, seem to have made word-building an amusement, and a high intellectual gratification. Hence the copiousness of forms, and the highly philosophical structure, of the dialects of some barbarous nations, of which scholars were unaware till our missionaries have made them known.* The process of the dropping of forms of declension and the shortening of words, is observable in our own English tongue; and the least inflected language may disclose a more modern state than one more inflected and more apparently artificial. All these states of language are found coexisting, and it is not always easy to show which exhibit the later stages of language, the polysyllabic, the dissyllabic, or the monosyllabic tongues. The argument from language utterly fails.

If the rise of languages does not require these almost countless ages, neither does the rise of Pagan Mythologies. Religious instincts exist in all men. If they do not like to retain God in their knowledge, He gives them over to a reprobate mind. Their decadence is rapid. They are eager in seeking out many inventions, and change the glory of the incorruptible God quickly into images made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Nor does the similarity of heathen superstitions prove their rites and worship to have been historically connected. There are but a few principles on which all pagan worship rests. The worship of heroes and benefactors, the adoration of the heavenly hosts, the deification of the powers of nature, or human passions, and the fear of demons, may give rise to rites among distant nations, in one and the same age; and these religions may have surprising coincidences, without any real connection one with another. Nor does the very welcome discovery of Mr. Horner, who, in boring at the foot of the colossal statue of Rameses the Second, brought up a fragment of

* Compare the Paradigm of the Verb in Wilson's Mpongue Grammar.

pottery from the depth of thirty-nine feet below the surface, which he regarded as evidence of the existence of man thirteen thousand three hundred and seventy-one years before 1854, which Bunsen has dwelt on with evident satisfaction, both in his "Bible Work" and in the preface to his third volume on Egypt, afford grounds for any such deduction. It could have fallen into some previous excavation or fissure; it could have been entangled with some floating timber, which the continual action of the water should have worked through great depths of slime, as it does the "sawyers" of the Mississippi. Rivers do not take counsel of men. Some times their eddies scoop out deep chasms in a few hours, to be again gradually filled, and some times the waters gently wanton around some imperishable substance, sinking for it a deep recess, or wearing away a profound grave for its burial.* How are any of these alleged proofs to be compared with the uniform testimony of Christ and the Apostles, as to the infallible testimony of Moses and the Prophets?

As to the Dynasties of Manetho, a portion of them, twenty-five thousand years, are by him assigned to the rule of Gods, Demigods, and Spirits. The five thousand years of the remainder were reduced by Manetho himself, according to Syncellus, to three thousand five hundred and fifty-five. Why? unless he suspected that many of them

---

* See a similar alleged fact in reference to the Mississippi River, referred to in Vol. IX. of this Review, p. 257. The Nile, like the Mississippi, some times changes its course. One thousand years ago it flowed hard by the present limits of Cairo, from which it now is a mile distant. Pottery might be found, probably, twenty feet below the present surface, where the old bed once was, deposited within the last one thousand years. At Sigiul, Mr. Horner says, the auger brought up burnt bricks and pottery from a depth of forty-five and fifty feet; and at Bessouse, from the depth of fifty-nine feet. Alas, for the argument! There is no structure of burnt brick in Egypt older than the Roman domination. The bricks and the pottery must have been deposited there since the Christian Era. See For. Quarterly, April, 1859, p. 232.

were contemporary. If his own faith was shaken in a portion, may he not, out of that desire to exalt his own nation, of which Egypt and other ancient nations afford so many examples, have left some doubtful points still remaining. Egypt was divided from the beginning into nomes, or districts. Heptanomis, the seven districts, is one of the names of Middle Egypt. It was customary in ancient times to call the sovereigns of very limited territories, kings. The kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela, five in number, had all together a domain, now covered by the Dead Sea, which could hardly exceed forty miles in length by eight in breadth. There was a time, mentioned in Herodotus, when a Dodekarchy reigned in Egypt, one of whom, Psammeticus, subdued the rest, and became sole monarch The idea of contemporaneous sovereigns and dynasties belongs especially to Egypt. Kings, too, were often co-regent.* How, we ask, is it possible that the knowledge of Germany should be unknown to France? And how was it possible that the Jews, an intelligent people, living now in Egypt, and always on its confines, should not know of a discrepancy between the chronology of the two nations, if such truly existed? How could Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, have permitted his countrymen to be so ignorant of what he must have himself known. Or how could he have imposed a false chronology upon them if he had desired? Especially, if a rectification of the current Hebrew chronology was attempted in the Greek version, prepared for the library of Ptolemy, why should the figures in that copy reach no higher? After reviewing the reasonings of Bun-

* This idea of contemporary dynasties was adopted by Eusebius, and is received by most modern Egyptologers. The able writer in the Foreign Quarterly rejects it. He puts an end, however, to the credibility of the Manethonic Dynasties, as handed down to us, claims that they are full of irreconcilable inconsistencies, and annihilates the entire chronological argument of Bunsen.

sen and Lepsius on the Manethonic Dynasties, Kurtz holds that, "in a scientific point of view, we are warranted in abiding by that Biblical chronology, the trustworthiness of which has not yet been shaken by any doubts cast upon it." To the same result have Rawlinson and Delitzch both arrived.

After this long, but somewhat necessary digression, we return to Bunsen's idea of the authorship of the five books of Moses. As to the materials out of which they are composed, he finds—1. Genealogical registers, or pedigrees; 2. Brief memoranda, appended to these, or detached from them; 3. Songs or hymns in commemoration of great events; and, 4. Detailed naratives. The distinction between the historian, the collections, and the documents, (or original traditions,) must, he says, be preserved throughout. There is no reason to suppose more than one real author. That is, before the author of our four first books of the Law, there was no book of Genesis, nor of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. Yet this one author found before him more than one collection, both of songs and genealogies, and these collections, so far as they related to the days of Moses, are already written down. On the contrary, in relation to the ante-Mosaic period, and especially that of the origines, we find the traces of an originally oral tradition, which can only be referred to Abraham and his descendants of the next five or six generations, who have handed it down. The true author of the books could not have lived earlier than the reign of Hezekiah. The book of Deuteronomy, which Delitzch makes the oldest, is wholly post-Mosaic, and was written in the last years of Hezekiah. Such are the conclusions of Chevalier Bunsen, which he has brought no new arguments to establish, none but what Hengstenberg and Hävernick had before considered and abundantly refuted, as we have shown in an early volume of this Review.

However high the inspiration he may give to Moses himself, the facts of those early histories, according to Bunsen, were handed down, in part, by a varying and uncertain tradition, or clothed in the garb of poetry. The narrator, who lived in the reign of Hezekiah, and "who was a man of wisdom and learning," gives with unmistakable honesty what he found lying before him at that time. But whether this is to be literally received, is another question. The popular tradition represented Pharaoh as drowned in the Red Sea. But Menephtha, whom he makes to be the monarch then reigning, did not thus die, but lived ingloriously fifteen years longer. Nor did the waves stand upright as an heap on either hand. All is founded in popular error. The fact of the case was, Palestinians, or a Bedouin host, perhaps instigated by Jethro, invaded the country, and the great Sicilian vespers took place, in which Asia took her revenge on Africa. These were the messengers of the Lord, who slew all the first-born, even in the king's palace. The exode then occurred. A body of troops were dispatched to attack the retiring multitude. These perished in the waves, but Menephtha himself fled with his son, then five years of age, to Ethiopia, and returned again thirteen years afterwards." *

These declarations we can not stop to refute. We can only say that the whole of this identification rests entirely on conjecture, and only shows how slight is the author's reluctance to go directly counter to the Scriptures. If Bunsen's speculations as to chronology are at all wrong, he will not be likely to fall on the name of the monarch then ruling in Egypt. Osborn makes him to have been Sethos the Second, who was an idle and profligate prince, who suddenly disappears from history, whose name appears on the face of his tomb, which was begun, and left unfinished, by him, and whose memory was consigned to infamy and

* Egypt's Place, IV., 558. Bibelwerk, V., 141, *et seq.*

oblivion by his subjects.* A writer in a contemporary journal identifies him with Thothmes the Second, predecessor of Thothmes the Third, of whom there remain "almost auto-biographical inscriptions at Karnak," recently deciphered by Brugsch, fixing the date of his accession, and of course of the death of his predecessor, in coincidence with the period of the exode, and of the drowning of Pharaoh in the Red Sea.† Both these can not be true, but either of them is as much entitled to be received on monumental and historic grounds as that of Bunsen, and neither comes in conflict with Scripture.

The Israelites are said to have wandered forty years in the wilderness, and to have eaten manna that length of time, and our Saviour speaks of this manna as *bread from heaven.*‡ But Bunsen says the forty years was the time between the exode and the passage of the Jordan, thirty-seven or thirty-eight years of this time being spent quietly on the east-Jordanic side of Palestine. The manna was local, and for a single season, the product of the Tarfah bush, found only in the Wady Pharan, and the account of its preservation over the Sabbath, and not on other days, belongs to popular poetry.§ And yet the manna of the Tarfah or Tamarisk exudes at the puncture of an insect, does not become rancid and breed worms, may be spread like butter or honey, but can not be ground in a mill, nor pounded in a mortar, nor made into bread, like the manna of the Israelites. It is produced by the labors of "lice and chafers," and can not be the "bread from heaven," nor the "angels' food," of which the children of Israel partook.

The Apostle Peter says that Balaam was rebuked for his iniquity; the dumb ass "speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the Prophet." But the Prussian Am-

---

* Monumental Hist. of Egypt, II., p. 594, *et seq.*

† British Quarterly, October, 1860.

‡ Num. 14 : 33; 32 : 13; Exod. 16 : 35; Neh. 9 : 21; John 6 : 32.

§ Bibelwerk, V., 160, 161.

bassador says this is a great mistake. The ass shied and fell under the Prophet's blows, like any other poor beast. The rest all passed in the thoughts and accusing voice of the Prophet. Paul says the Israelites did all drink of that same miraculous rock; and the idea is found in various places of Scripture. The Chevalier Bunsen says, No. The writer in Hezekiah's time honestly thought so, for so the popular tradition, five hundred years after the facts, incorrectly reported. As to the repetition of the act in Kadesh, (Numbers xx: 8, 12,) the account is obscure and perplexed; all that can be authentic is the discovery and opening of a spring situated in the rocks of Kadesh. Yet the "waters of Massah and Meribah" are echoed and reëchoed throughout the Old Testament.

In like manner he speaks of Elijah. He was the most highly gifted and holy man of the heroic age, the only one of them, indeed, whose life did not end as a tragedy. His departure was not a sun-set, but a transfiguration. Yet, not the apotheosis which is believed. The whole narrative of his life is a popular epic from beginning to end, a legend, but not a myth. The historicalness of his life and personality is, says our author, not thereby endangered. Nothing but boundless ignorance, fool-hardy hypocrisy, or weak-headed fanaticism, can demand the faith of the Church for such a miracle as a historic truth. It is evident, from the narrative, that his disciples, more than a hundred in number, had a presentiment of their master's determination to separate himself from them, without a formal adieu, never to return. Elijah had already often lived apart from them in the wilderness of Judah and Arabia, as well as under the protection of the Sidonian republic, quite alone. He had, in the heights of Horeb, seen the Eternal. There, or in some other quiet spot, he sought, renouncing all earthly strife and passion, the life of God. An animated eulogium of his beloved disciple, Elisha, on his departing master, spread among the people: 'My

Father! My Father! The chariot of Israel and horsemen thereof!' The defence, *i. e.*, and the glory and honor of thy people! Does not this truly historic expression, with the promise made to Elisha, that if he should see him when he should be taken away from him, he should receive a double portion of his spirit, shine through and explain the legend? 'And it came to pass, as they still went on and talked, that behold! there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up, by a whirlwind, into heaven.'"

But we withhold our hand from any further introduction of these exegetical feats of our learned author, as extraordinary in their boldness as they are trifling and godless in their spirit. The author himself acknowledges, in reference to this last conjecture, about the translation of Elijah, that we need some objective statements of a chronological character, to justify the view of the epic (?) records respecting that prophet, and some critical apparatus by which to subject the story of his translation to the test of a historical criticism. We agree with him. He does, in truth, need some kind of apparatus. He seems to us to be working in the very fire, and wearying himself for very vanity. If there is a supernatural revelation, it should be sustained by supernatural testimony, and may be expected to record things beyond the regular succession of natural events.

We will only here say, that the same destructive criticism which Bunsen has applied to the Pentateuch, he has also applied to the books which immediately succeed them. He says, 1. That we have contemporary records for many points of the internal and external history of the seven centuries, from Moses to the downfall of the kingdom; 2. These documents are partly historical, partly poetical—statistical notes, or songs and proverbs; 3. Some of these have been wrought over, and others retained in their original form. The last go back to the passage of the Jordan, or

even to the year 1280 B. C.; 4. Oral tradition has been written down, some times soon after the events, some times by later collectors and the historian to whom these books owe their present form; 5. The writer of the histories of the last times of the monarchy, can not be earlier than the second half of the captivity, yet lived before Ezra; 6. The preceding books are earlier, but Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, bear traces of a later hand. If, now, it be inquired if these naratives in general are authentically historic, and if the authentic portion can be distinguished from that which proceeds from popular tradition, he answers in the affirmative. He says, however, that they are only in a small portion strictly historical. The chasms in the history are numerous, much which has the historic form belongs to the realm of the ideal, and we possess, for the times before the exile, only late, and, in great part, legendary accounts, and later ideas are borne over into the earlier narratives. To the inquiry, whether these different materials do not unite, in the principal points of the narrative, into a harmonious historical form, though the tradition is not exact and complete, he answers affirmatively. We can separate the authentic documentary portions, and they are more important, especially for the earliest times, than is commonly allowed. The book of Joshua is composed, 1. Of contemporary documents, being historical records, purely authentic; 2. Of very ancient popular songs relating to isolated expeditions; 3. Of a traditionary narrative which was reduced to writing before David. Samuel and his prophetic school wrote down, probably, these oral traditions. The final Reducteur lived in the times of the captivity, or soon after. The book of Judges has the same elements, substantially authentic, but partly historico-epic, and received its final form in the times of the later kings. The two books of Samuel are founded upon the traditions which proceeded from the school of the prophets over which he presided, but obtained their final form in the

days of Hezekiah, or soon after. He was, in some respects, a second Moses. The maintenance and restoration of the Law Moses gave, was his life-long effort. He is the preserver of the original documents, which assumed their present form four centuries and a half later. He preserved, also, the memory of the words and deeds of the old prophets, and to his school we owe the preservation, in general, of those sources whence the books of Joshua and Judges afterwards came. In his day, the Scriptures we now have did not, in any proper sense, exist. Neither the men of God of a former time composed any thing, nor Samuel himself. But the collections of the school over which he presided furnish the ground-work of the first portion of the former prophets. The two books of Kings were composed during the exile whose thirty-seventh year is named in the history of Joachim. Chronicles was written after the book of Ezra, but before the Maccabean age. The book of Ecclesiastes was written under the Persian rule. It is an open question whether the book of Daniel was written in the times of Nebuchadnezzar, or in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 169 B. C. *

We confess ourselves wearied by the greatness of the way over which this German philosopher and statesman has carried us. And lest we should, on our part, weary others, we will make no attempt to discuss the points involved in the immediately preceding statements. Though his work on the Scriptures is yet imperfect, and the part already published contains his views only on a part of the Old Testament, we can judge of the Hercules from the foot now exposed to us. With all Chevalier Bunsen's professed regard for religion, he assumes, with other Rationalists, a most scornful air towards the clergy; those, we presume, who oppose him, who wonder at his pompous intrusion into their own domain, at his contemptuous sneers at any

* Band, V., Bibelurkunden, pp. 475–555.

who differ with him, at his claim to immense superiority of learning, at his disposition to hustle them out of the temple of theological science, and to take possession of it himself. Shall they dare to contest these matters of chronology with this hierophant of the mysteries of Egypt, to whom the hieroglyphics yield up their secrets, and who can tell so well how many milleniums it took before a man out of a noun could manufacture a verb, and how many more it required to learn how to attach terminations of gender, number and person. How superior this mighty man to that clergy who "fabricate even historic truth, who strenuously exert themselves to destroy historical science where ever it is possible, in order to bring us back to the dark ages," whose worship is "a dogmatising Bibliolatry," who use "their Bible as a cloak for indolence and want of reflection," who, "from cowardice or superstition," maintain still the great length of the antediluvian generations, who make the Bible "the fig-leaf of ignorance and indolence." All these things it is reserved for German research to set right. They are the people! endued with the gift of clairvoyance, if not into the future, yet into the past, and the Prussian Ambassador the most clairvoyant of them all. And yet we seem to hear a mighty voice out of the whirlwind, saying to all this, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding."

We can only very briefly indicate our reasons for still entertaining the traditional faith of the Church respecting the Scriptures. With the same force of reasoning might the theory of Eichorn, that the four Gospels came gradually into existence, and were received and pronounced upon by the Church at the close of the second century, and not before, be propounded as a matter of fact, as the theory of Bunsen and his predecessors of the skeptical school has

been in reference to the books of the Old Testament. He has, however, condescended to say that the Gospel of John is no myth, no invention of the later Gnostics; that there is a historical Christ, and that if there were not, all Christian faith were a delusion, our creed hypocrisy, our worship a juggle, and the Reformation a crime or a mistake. If the Christian Scriptures are indeed to be received, then are the Jewish to be received also. The quotations from the Old Testament in the New, count by hundreds; the allusions by many hundreds more. The views of Christ and the Apostles can not be mistaken. They held the men who wrote these Scriptures, and not merely the men of whom they wrote, to be inspired. The writing itself is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and is an infallible record. It is not the jotting down, however faithful, of popular tradition and legendary story, which one is to receive or not, as he pleases. But with these men, "Thus saith the Scripture," is the authoritative decision that settles all. *Ἡ γραφὴ λέγει*, and *τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει*, "The Scripture saith," and "The Spirit saith," are terms of equal value. Ninety of these direct quotations are from the Pentateuch, and there are one hundred references to it besides. In many of these Moses is spoken of as the author, and not simply as the one whose history is given, in the Book. "When Moses is *read*," says Paul; "Moses *describeth* the righteousness of the Law;" "We have found him of whom Moses did *write*." "MOSES *wrote*," says the Saviour, and not the compiler in Hezekiah's day, "if a man's brother die," etc. This which he thus wrote stood then, as now, at the beginning of the Scriptures. "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." The Scripture thus written was *θεοπνευστος*, inspired of God; the men who wrote it were moved by the Holy Ghost, and were "in the Spirit," in his power and under his influence, which penetrated, stirred and guided the whole powers of the writer. If this is Bibliolatry, *venia sit verbo*, the Master

and the servants were Bibliolaters alike. If this was narrow Judaic superstition, mechanical inspiration, theological pharasaism, let us be content to share the reproach with Machtspruch, and the Lord and His disciples. There are two reasons why inspiration extends to the words, if it is in any respect plenary and sufficient to render the Scripture a rule to man. In the first place, in man's present state the λόγος of speech stands over against the λόγος of reason, and the suggestion of the thought brings also the word which expresses it, and the one is thus married to the other. And then, in practice, we find in a single word, oft-times, volumes of precious truth, which in our meditations we never exhaust, which would be wanting if the word was wanting, or different from what it is. This is an argument for verbal inspiration, and for closeness of translation, when translation is resorted to for popular use. If recourse may be had to rationalistic interpretation in matters of fact, so also in matters of doctrine, and "the precious things of Scripture" fade out before this destructive process.

The reason expressly given by Josephus why the Jewish writings subsequent to Artaxerxes were no part of the Canon, was, that they were uninspired, and that the succession of prophets had ceased. This was the common view of his nation, who were appointed by God as the receivers and conservators of the documents of our faith, till the time should come when they should pass over from one tribe of the family of Shem, to the tents of Ham and the dwellings of Japheth. We may take our station where we will in the Old Testament history, in the times subsequent to Moses, and the Codex of the Thora is already in existence. It regulates the worship, controls the customs, is the basis of all judicial decisions, sends its influence over social and domestic life, and is expected to control all parties, from the king on the throne to the slave that toils in the field or bears the sandals of his master. It is referred to, as to its substance, from Malachi to the times

of the Judges, and the division of Canaan itself was made by Joshua, his immediate successor, in accordance with predictions found recorded in Genesis. In the references to the Mosaic Law in this post-Mosaic literature, the expression often is shaped according to the words we now find written. In all the legislation found in these books there is nothing post-Mosaic, the brief expressions which indicate a later hand are, with the exception of Deut. xxxiv., unimportant, and are added for explanation, and added previous to the time when inspiration had ceased. The number of them, too, is diminished by a just interpretation, which rescues them from the hands of an unbelieving criticism, that dictates and will not learn, that prescribes what must be, and receives not what is. When you approach the writings of the Scriptures in a different direction, Genesis is the root of the tree of Revelation, "the anticipation," says Delitzsch, "of The Law, the Law the anticipation of the Old Testament, the Old Testament of the religion of redemption, redemption of the world of the present and its history—upon the pillars of this Book rests the edifice of our salvation, which reaches upward and forward into eternity." A meet and fitting outline and adumbration is it of the good things to come, a needed introduction to the whole system of divine revelation, without which the rest would be scarcely understood. It solves the greatest questions which lie at the foundation of all religion and all human history, and if we had it not, there would be a great chasm felt in all human knowledge. The future history of the Church and man would be like a river without a spring-head, a castle hung in the sky, without a foundation.

Whether the writer of Genesis was the first to reduce to writing the primeval history, and the story of the creation, and was informed of these things by a species of supernatural intuition akin to the prophetic, yet looking backward, or found in existence more ancient records from

patriarchal pens, is a matter not of prime importance as to the authority of this Book. It is necessary, absolutely, to this authority that the writer who penned it in the form we have it, should be inspired, not by an ordinary indwelling of the Spirit, but by that extraordinary guidance ascribed in the Scriptures to Apostles and prophets, and which operated in its highest power on the human mind of the man of Nazareth, who was also the divine author of our salvation.

Bunsen is another, added to the numerous class of German scholars, who have handled these topics of sacred history substantially in the same form. To the *document hypothesis*, broached by Ilgen in 1798, has succeeded the *fragment hypothesis* of Valer, in 1805, the *supplement hypothesis* of Tuch, in 1838, advocated also by Knobel, and to which Delitzsch, more lately, in a different spirit, and with high views of inspiration, has given a modified assent; and the *christalization hypothesis* of Ewald, as Delitzsch calls it, which supposes four authors, whose works have been incorporated by a fifth, into their present form. To these has succeeded that of Vaihinger, proposed in Herzog's Cyclopedia, with his three sources, the Præ Elohist, the Elohist, and the Jehovist, each supplementing the other.

Our space will not permit us to dwell longer on these points. An ingenious man can propound theories which it would require volumes to overthrow. If proposed with the ability and learning of a Tuch and an Ewald, they will have weight with many who will give heed to the most inconsistent fables. Learning can be lavished on theories the most baseless. It was in a book replete with knowledge that Lord Mouboddo, no mean lawyer and judge, extolled the blessings of savage over civilized life, and put forth his notion that man is only a monkey bereft of his tail.

Bunsen appears to have been a man of a genial nature,

and of generous impulses, and to have numbered many Christian men among his friends. It is the more to be regretted that his unsafe speculations, his arbitrary reasoning and his dogmatism should shake the confidence in his soundness and ingenuousness of those who revered him while living. He was social, accessible, cheerful and enthusiastic, and won the good will of many with whom he came in contact. But more and more, as the labors of his life have approached their termination, has it been perceived how far he was overstepping the boundaries of truth, and on what inadequate and fanciful grounds he was willing to confound all the records of the past. In proportion to the grief of these friends, has been the triumph of skeptical and latitudinarian men, who have solaced themselves with the accession of this new name, as they have supposed, to their own ranks. His friend, Pressensé, who acknowledges the unhappy direction his speculations have taken, says, in his defence, that "he traversed the great theological crisis of the times, and was affected by it in many of his opinions. His only desire was, as he often said, to throw a bridge between contemporary thought, tormented with many doubts, and Christianity. It mattered little to him whether the bridge stood or was broken, provided a safe passage was effected to the other bank." But there will always be those who will need to pass over, and broken bridges are in the way, and give no relief. He has, we fear, been a most unfortunate architect. The bridge of Languages has failed; the bridge of Mythologies has broken down; the bridge of the Antediluvian Generations has been found unsound; the bridge of the Manethonic Dynasties has given signs of dissolution, and is condemned by wise master-builders; the bridge of the Historical Epos is floating off; and there remains but the cloud-phantom of an inspiration, in which nothing is communicated, and nothing rendered sure, but the whole

record is blurred with harmful blots, marred with human weakness, and divested of all that was thought divine. So far as he shall be instrumental in conveying to the minds of the common people these unbelieving thoughts respecting the Word of God, his life of labor will bear evil fruit, "the grapes of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrah."

Yet, as we have ever been reluctant to say how much ignorance in the lowly may yet be compatible with salvation, so we are afraid to say how much mistake and error and vain speculation may exist in the intelligent and exalted, and God yet own them as his. There have been some words of controversy respecting the death-bed scenes of this distinguished man. Some have been unable to understand how such error of the head could coexist with such apparent piety of the heart. Some have considered that to the aspiring philosopher there might be two realms of thought, one the region of speculation, the other of emotion, and that the heart may be true when the intellect goes far astray. Others are unwilling to allow this *dichotomy* of our moral nature, and suppose that by the grace of God he was raised in his last days out of the trammels of his system, restored to the simple faith in which he was reared in childhood, and brought to exercise a humble trust in Christ as a Saviour. A more unfriendly opinion than either has also been entertained. As we have said so much in condemnation, we will, as an act of justice, permit his friend, who seems to be clothed with authority to do so, to speak of the closing hours of his long life.

M. Pressensé describes the charm of Bunsen's conversation on his last visit to Paris: "So rich, so intellectual, and so cordial, all penetrated with that religious salt whose pungent savor none can imitate," and his whole person "so full of moral youth under his crown of white hair." He speaks, also, with much tenderness of his last hours: "M. de Bunsen desired the prolongation of his existence

till he should terminate the labors he had commenced. One night he perceived that such was not the will of God, and he lifted himself from his chair, crying 'O God, I commit my spirit into thy hands.' He then caused all his family to approach, and said to them, 'A great change has taken place in my thoughts, not as to my immortal soul, nor as to Christ, my only Saviour, but in regard to my body.' Having blessed his children, and expressed his grateful affection for the faithful companion of his life, in the most touching terms, saying that he had loved in her that which is eternal, (*In dir liebte ich das Ewoge,*) 'O God!' he cried, 'be pleased to bless my friends! May my country be blessed, and Italy and her liberty! May Prussia, Germany, England, the entire world, be blessed! I desire every benediction to the Prince and Princess of Prussia! Gratitude for Niebuhr.'" Niebuhr had introduced M. de Bunsen into the career which he so worthily filled. After he had thanked his domestic with the truest affection, with a heavenly expression on his countenance, he thus resumed: "In spite of all my weaknesses and my sufferings, I have desired, I have sought, that which is noble here below! But my most delightful experience is to have known Jesus Christ. I quit this world without hatred to any person—no, not hatred, hate is accursed! Oh, how good to contemplate this exalted life! We know now what an obscure existence we have led on the earth. Above! Above! It is dark no longer, but brighter and brighter always! I am now in the kingdom of God. Till now it was but a foretaste. O, my God, how lovely are thy tabernacles!"

The 29th of October, as they pointed out to him the radiant sunset—"Yes," said he, in English, "it is beautiful, the love of God is in every thing." "May God bless you for ever," said he, in French. "Let us part in Christ Jesus. God is life, is love, the love which wills, the will that loves,

(*Wollendes Lieben, liebendes Wollen*). *Christus recognoscitur victor, Christus est, Christus est victor.* For him to be is to conquer. There is no death with God. I see Christ and I see God through Christ." * * * * "All the rest is nothing. Christ is the Son of God, and we are the children of God only when the spirit of love which was in Christ is in us."

"Such," says Pressensé, "was the last word of this long and brilliant life. To love God in Christ is every thing, the rest is nothing. Behold the theology of the death-bed, behold the science of the Christian's last agony!"

May we trust that his spirit has now gone where there is no darkness at all; where the errors, and the ambitious, trifling, and unfruitful studies of earth are laid aside; where nothing exists but light, truth and love? "His funeral obsequies were affecting and appropriate. His coffin was borne first by his sons, then by the students of the University of Bonn, covered with garlands of flowers, after the German custom, and accompanied by all the town, with the solemn sounds of those songs of his nation, which he had loved so well. The pastor, who had administered the communion to him some days before, pronounced over his open grave the words of eternal life, and they retired, saying that Germany had lost a great citizen, science one of its most eminent representatives, and the Church a fervent Christian, who died confessing his faith in Christ." Such is the touching narrative of his last hours, given by Pressensé in the *Revue Chrétienne* of December last.

ARTICLE VI.

A VINDICATION OF SECESSION AND THE SOUTH.

Discourse delivered by Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, *on the day of National Humiliation, January 4th,* 1861, *at Lexington, Ky.*

Our Country: its Peril, and its Deliverance. From advance sheets of the Danville Quarterly Review for March, 1861. *By the* Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Danville Theological Seminary.

Perhaps no writer in the Presbyterian Church is more entitled to a respectful hearing upon the questions which now agitate and divide the country, than the author of the two pamphlets whose titles are given above. The studies and pursuits of his early manhood were precisely such as to acquaint him with the subjects involved; while his great intellect, which has never faltered in any investigation, is fully competent to grasp the nature of parties, to expound the principles upon which they are formed, and to depict the results to which they naturally tend. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Danville Quarterly should signalize its advent into the circle of periodical literature by an elaborate political essay from the pen of its most distinguished editor, nor that this production should be selected and sent forth as an *avant courier* to herald its approach. When, too, the newspaper press announced the topics through which the discussion would range, public expectation was raised on tiptoe, prepared for a disquisition very far above the ordinary level of political harangues. Under an arrangement of subjects at once philosophical and exhaustive, such a thinker as Dr. Breckinridge might, if any

one could, offer a solution of existing political problems. Considering, further, the position of Kentucky in the struggle now pending, one could not but be curious to see the middle ground which Danville should occupy between Princeton and Columbia; between the defence of Black Republicanism, on the one hand, and the advocacy of Secession on the other. It would be unjust to say that these anticipations have been wholly disappointed; for upon every page the characteristics of the author's mind are clearly impressed. Of no living writer can it be said with more emphasis, in the language of Milton, that his books "preserve as in a vial the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them." Yet, after all, we are constrained to say that, viewing it as a whole, we have laid this pamphlet down, after a third perusal, with a feeling of disappointment raised to the third degree. As a great State paper, explaining either the way by which the country has become involved in its present entanglements, or solving the method of its extrication, it falls immeasurably below what might have been expected from the source whence it is derived. Aside from the glittering generalities in which it abounds, and uncovered of the dogmatism in which it is enveloped, it simply revives, in its boldest and most offensive form, the doctrine of a consolidated nationality held by the old Federalists; and proceeds, upon this view, to counsel the Government at Washington, temperately, but with parental firmness, to chasten into submission seven refractory sovereignties! We can imagine the smile stealing over the visage of some experienced statesman at the temerity with which this exploded political heresy is revived; and at the coolness with which the opposite theory is ignored, which, nevertheless, has generally prevailed through the history of American legislation to the present time. When so fertile a mind as that of this eminent Divine can suggest nothing to meet the exigencies of the

Union but what is contained in this pamphlet, it is fair to conclude the bottom of the argument on that side to be reached. And if a decisive proof is required to show the necessity of the great revolution which has taken place at the South, it is furnished in this final argument, which constructs for the whole country a despotism as overwhelming and hopeless as any which has bowed down and broken the spirit of man in any age or portion of the world.

We shall endeavor to make these positions good in the following pages. Dr. Breckinridge is too old a polemic to hope, in a time of deep agitation, like the present, that any *ex cathedra* pronunciation of his opinions can shield them from scrutiny. He may rest assured, however, that no expression shall consciously fall from this pen, inconsistent with that profound respect in which his genius and reputation have been held by the writer for more than twenty years.

In order that the reader may be able to judge of the fairness and sufficiency of this rejoinder, it will be necessary to present an analysis of the pamphlet under review. Like a true philosopher, Dr. Breckinridge begins with the beginning. In tracing the perils of the country, he can of course rise no higher than to the "spirit of anarchy," of which they are all begotten; which is accordingly made the *first* of his five divisions. This spirit of anarchy commenced with the Abolition party; existing only as a fanaticism, from which it speedily rose to the dignity of a State principle, in the liberty bills which were afterwards enacted —mounting at length to the highest national importance, by dividing the whole nation into two opposite parties—and, finally, upon Mr. Lincoln's election, reaching its consummation in the secession of seven States from the Federal Union. Amidst this chaos, the author proceeds, in his *second* leading division, to consider whether there remains

any ground for hope and effort. From a number of facts rapidly grouped together, such as that a large minority in the North is thoroughly opposed to the distinctive principles of the Republican party, that many who voted for Mr. Lincoln, are far more Whigs and Americans than Republicans, that many Republicans themselves are patriotic men, who, upon any clear issue, will not hesitate to sacrifice their party to their country; from these facts, he infers a speedy and certain revolution in the Northern mind, which will sweep from power the anarchists who have brought the country to the verge of ruin. In like manner, assuming that the secession of the Cotton States has not been, as to the popular masses, either spontaneous or cordial, but the result of an organized conspiracy, which has hurried those States along by a sudden and irresistible current of opinion, he predicts a corresponding reaction at the South; so that if the border slave States shall remain steadfast in their loyalty to the Union, "the secession movement must prove a failure, both as to its avowed and as to any concealed object." To guard against the defection of these, certain "immense considerations" are presented; in the statement of which we have a very distinct enunciation of the author's Federal creed. This argument is enforced by the two additional considerations, that "this blind and fierce spirit of anarchy" is "in frightful antagonism to the total civilization of the age," as well as to "the dominion and purpose of God over and concerning our country," which is neither, on the one hand, that slavery should be extinguished, nor, on the other, that it should be perpetuated. So endeth the second lesson.

The question of negro slavery being the occasion, at least, if not the cause, of these commotions, it becomes necessary, in the *third* chapter, to consider whether any view of it can be presented, upon which the whole country should harmonize. "It may be discussed in the light

of divine revelation, or in the light of the law of nature, or in the light of the political and municipal institutions of the countries where it exists." In this last aspect, the author affirms "there ought to be no dispute concerning it," it being strictly a domestic institution, with which no State nor the General Government may interfere in any wise—every plea to the contrary being immoral in itself, and revolutionary in its tendency.

As regards the law of nature, the grand difficulty occurs of interpreting its utterances, as made by the *human reason*, by *the common impulses of the human soul*, by *the common opinion and belief of the race*, and by *the actual execution of the law*, in the common state of that race in all ages. But "human reason," the author concludes, "lands the problem very nearly in a paradox." The common impulse of the soul towards freedom "is no evidence that restraint is wrong," and "fails of proving that they who cherish it would do aught but mischief," if it were universally gratified. If, again, "it was the common belief of the race, that servitude was contrary to the nature of man, then the race had before it always, in the actual condition of a larger part, the clearest proof that the belief was absurd." And finally, the testimony from the actual execution of the law is frightful and universal, to wit: that "all, every where, have felt themselves to be naturally impelled to reduce each other into a condition of subjection." From these confused and perhaps "contradictory utterances," it only remains to turn to "the Word of God, where this great problem is completely solved." In the light of this Book, Dr. Breckinridge considers "human servitude, in all its forms, as one of the badges of the fallen condition of the human race," and incident to man in a state of probationary discipline as a sinner. Like war and sickness, and sorrow and poverty, and pain and affliction, which are evils incident to man's fallen state, and often sanctified and

converted into blessings, so servitude exists "because our condition is just what it is, a condition of sin and misery in a state of probation," and "utterly incapable of being permanently and universally abolished, while this state of sin and misery continues attended with probation." "Throughout the total revelation which God has made to man, under the dispensations of Abraham, of Moses, and of Christ, embracing human servitude as it is, Abrahamic, Jewish, Christian and heathen—and the heathen aspect of it presented in every nation of antiquity, Asiatic, African and European; in not a single instance is it represented as a thing good in itself, or as a thing sinful in itself, but always as a thing actually existing, always to be expected, allowed by God, considered and treated in His law, regulated by His providence, wholly indifferent as concerning His grace, and to enter into our final account with Him, both as we may be masters and as we may be servants." The final inference is, that God's Word, being the only source from which a positive and safe judgment can be formed, "condemns all the pretexts concerning negro slavery, whether at the North or the South, upon which the public mind has been lashed into madness."

Plainly, if these conclusions shall be universally accepted, there is no reason why the question of slavery should destroy the integrity of the country. The way is then open for the author, in his *fourth* section, to submit a project for an *amicable settlement.*

Believing the Federal Constitution to recognize property in slaves, and to provide for the return of such as escape from service, and firmly persuaded of the equality of the States in the Union, and especially as that bears upon the question of slavery in the Territories, these two points offer a clear basis for this settlement. In what practicable form this common right to a common property shall be recognized, is rather intimated than formally expressed.

But as all the Territories can not be made wholly free, nor wholly slave, without a dissolution of the Union, no alternative remains but an equitable division of the common domain, founded upon the recognition of a common inheritance.

As, however, the concession of both these points must be made by the North, which has the numerical majority, what hope is there of inducing her to consent to the same in the face of the Personal Liberty Bills passed in many of the States, and in opposition to the dogma upon which Mr. Lincoln comes into power, the repression of slavery within the Territories? The considerations which Dr. Breckinridge urges to induce the acceptance of these terms, are as follows: "That with the North the whole affair is a sentiment, an opinion—that she has not one dollar of estate at stake—not one dollar of income directly dependent on slavery; with her, slavery has no necessary bearing upon the social, economical, personal or political condition of any State or individual; and, finally, as this nation was once composed exclusively of slave States, every consideration of decency and good faith obliges her to be more, instead of less, observant of the duties she owes to those who remain in the condition once common to all." On these points the contrast is so great between her position and that of the South, that "the whole feeling of loyalty to the Union in the South, is connected with an abiding confidence that the North will act as becomes her in this emergency." He plainly intimates that only by such concessions can "the secession pestilence" be arrested, and that "upon these two points public opinion in the slave States which have not seceded, is struggling at this moment." Such, then, is the balance in which this amicable settlement is now suspended.

Nothing remains for the author to discuss, under his *fifth* head, but the duty of the Government at Washington in

relation to secession. Having assumed that this is a consolidated nation, secession comes to be denounced as sedition, anarchy and rebellion, which must be crushed by the central authority. "By the express terms, as well by the very nature of the Federal Constitution, a secession ordinance in the South is as totally void as a personal liberty law in the North can possibly be." "There was no more legal necessity, nor any more logical consistency, in diatribes about lack of power to *coerce a State*, in one case than in the other." The doctrine that the people of a State are citizens of the United States only through its own Constitution and Government, is pronounced a political falsehood, and the power is declared complete to execute the laws of the United States upon *every citizen of the United States*, where ever found. He declares it "sheer folly to weaken the posture of the General Government towards the secession movement;" and is accordingly very severe upon those at the North who have united in protests against coercion, as all this but tends to "avert the coming reaction which may save the country." His deliberate counsel, therefore, is, in this great emergency, that the General Government shall steadily but temperately enforce the laws, postal, revenue, and every other, in all the seceding States, in utter disregard of all the ordinances these latter may have enacted, avoiding armed collision, except in repelling force by force. By this policy, to which he denies the term coercion, the voice that has not yet been heard, and the hand that has not yet been lifted—even the voice and the hand of this *great nation*—will be raised to restore the old Union to its former integrity.

We have thus presented a fair but condensed summary of the pamphlet under review. Without following the ramifications of the argument, or taking up many valuable side thoughts, by which it is enforced—which, with so terse and suggestive a writer, would require the transcription of

the entire essay—we have faithfully followed the main track of thought from beginning to end. As the reader may have perceived, there is not a single new suggestion—not a single principle—which, however ably put by the writer, has not been presented fifty times before. Indeed, his argument has no value except as addressed to the border States, dissuading them from being drawn into the vortex of secession, or as an irenicum addressed to the North, stemming the tide of abolition sentiment, and securing the guarantees necessary to satisfy Southern feeling in Kentucky and elsewhere. It was mainly with these objects in view, we suppose the argument to have been constructed. Had Dr. Breckinridge been content to restrain his discussion within that range, we should not have considered it necessary to offer a reply. Desirable as it may be, for many reasons, that all the slave States should unite in forming a homogeneous Confederacy, yet this is a matter which must be remitted to the sovereign discretion of each. We, at least, have no desire to dictate the course which others should pursue; and Dr. Breckinridge, as a loyal son of Kentucky, might, without a word of dissent from us, assist in moulding the local policy of his own State. So, again, we can not but wish that the fanatical North may be dispossessed of him whose "name is Legion," and be found at last "clothed and in their right mind," prepared to fulfil their sworn obligations to the Constitution, to which they have so long been recreant. The views presented to this end, in the third section of the pamphlet before us, we substantially endorse. They are precisely such, for the most part, as have been held by Christian men throughout the South for many years; and are considerably in advance of what we had supposed Dr. Breckinridge could conscientiously defend. We congratulate him on the satisfactory progress he has made since 1849, when he could advocate prospective emancipation in Kentucky, distinctly upon the grounds

that hereditary slavery was "contrary to the natural rights of mankind," "opposed to the fundamental principles of free government," "inconsistent with a state of sound morality," and "hostile to the prosperity of the Commonwealth." * We do not charge this as an inconsistency, but note it as a sign of progress. It gives us hope that, if Kentucky shall see fit to repudiate his principles in 1861 as unequivocally as she did in 1849, he may yet find his way even to defend secession itself, as not repugnant to the principles of sound republicanism. However this may be, we have no strictures to make upon his present exposition of negro slavery, as condemned neither by the clear teachings of revelation, on the one hand, nor by the confused utterances of the law of nature on the other. We sincerely hope his pregnant suggestions upon this subject may be kindly accepted by his neighbors north of the Ohio.

But the limits within which he might have written and reigned with undisturbed supremacy have been transcended.

> "No pent up Utica confines his powers,
> The whole boundless Continent is his."

No government will fill the eye of his ambition, which does not span the breadth of a hemisphere, and bathe its feet at once in the waters of the Gulf and of the Lakes. The silver trumpet is taken from the wall to break the slumber of an enchanted nation, which must rise and shake itself for an imperial career. The spectre of disunion must hie back to its grave among the buried seditions of the past. Whole States, stripped of their sovereignty, stand shivering before his buffeting and scorn, to be sent, like whipped children of the nursery, whimpering and supperless to bed. In short, Dr. Breckinridge has spoiled a fine part by overacting. Had he been content to advise Kentucky, without abusing South Carolina—had he been satisfied with sooth-

* Biblical Repertory, October, 1849, vol. 21.

the entire essay—we have faithfully followed the main track of thought from beginning to end. As the reader may have perceived, there is not a single new suggestion—not a single principle—which, however ably put by the writer, has not been presented fifty times before. Indeed, his argument has no value except as addressed to the border States, dissuading them from being drawn into the vortex of secession, or as an irenicum addressed to the North, stemming the tide of abolition sentiment, and securing the guarantees necessary to satisfy Southern feeling in Kentucky and elsewhere. It was mainly with these objects in view, we suppose the argument to have been constructed. Had Dr. Breckinridge been content to restrain his discussion within that range, we should not have considered it necessary to offer a reply. Desirable as it may be, for many reasons, that all the slave States should unite in forming a homogeneous Confederacy, yet this is a matter which must be remitted to the sovereign discretion of each. We, at least, have no desire to dictate the course which others should pursue; and Dr. Breckinridge, as a loyal son of Kentucky, might, without a word of dissent from us, assist in moulding the local policy of his own State. So, again, we can not but wish that the fanatical North may be dispossessed of him whose "name is Legion," and be found at last "clothed and in their right mind," prepared to fulfil their sworn obligations to the Constitution, to which they have so long been recreant. The views presented to this end, in the third section of the pamphlet before us, we substantially endorse. They are precisely such, for the most part, as have been held by Christian men throughout the South for many years; and are considerably in advance of what we had supposed Dr. Breckinridge could conscientiously defend. We congratulate him on the satisfactory progress he has made since 1849, when he could advocate prospective emancipation in Kentucky, distinctly upon the grounds

that hereditary slavery was "contrary to the natural rights of mankind," "opposed to the fundamental principles of free government," "inconsistent with a state of sound morality," and "hostile to the prosperity of the Commonwealth." * We do not charge this as an inconsistency, but note it as a sign of progress. It gives us hope that, if Kentucky shall see fit to repudiate his principles in 1861 as unequivocally as she did in 1849, he may yet find his way even to defend secession itself, as not repugnant to the principles of sound republicanism. However this may be, we have no strictures to make upon his present exposition of negro slavery, as condemned neither by the clear teachings of revelation, on the one hand, nor by the confused utterances of the law of nature on the other. We sincerely hope his pregnant suggestions upon this subject may be kindly accepted by his neighbors north of the Ohio.

But the limits within which he might have written and reigned with undisturbed supremacy have been transcended.

> "No pent up Utica confines his powers,
> The whole boundless Continent is his."

No government will fill the eye of his ambition, which does not span the breadth of a hemisphere, and bathe its feet at once in the waters of the Gulf and of the Lakes. The silver trumpet is taken from the wall to break the slumber of an enchanted nation, which must rise and shake itself for an imperial career. The spectre of disunion must hie back to its grave among the buried seditions of the past. Whole States, stripped of their sovereignty, stand shivering before his buffeting and scorn, to be sent, like whipped children of the nursery, whimpering and supperless to bed. In short, Dr. Breckinridge has spoiled a fine part by overacting. Had he been content to advise Kentucky, without abusing South Carolina—had he been satisfied with sooth-

* Biblical Repertory, October, 1849, vol. 21.

ing the factious North, without crying the dogs of war upon the hunted South—this rejoinder would never have been evoked. The cloak of the philosopher has been too scant to hide the burly form of the partisan. He pours forth his defamatory charges upon the seceding States with a wealth of expression only at the command of this great master of the English tongue. Anarchy, disloyalty, revolt, revolution, rebellion, fanaticism, sedition, form the alphabet of an almost exhaustless invective, which, by endless transposition and iteration, make up a description so hideous that its very deformity should prove it a caricature. His caustic denunciation can only expend itself in superlatives specially constructed by coupling together the fiercest phrases. Secession is not simply secession, but it is "the secession pestilence," or it is "the explosion of human passions," or "a revolution accomplished by terror, under the guidance of irresistible fanaticism." It is not only anarchy, but "anarchy fierce and blind," in "frightful antagonism to the total civilization of the age." It not only springs from hatred of the Union, but a hatred that is "chronic" and "frantic." It is "a movement in revolting disregard towards God's dealings," and "proclaims shocking conceptions of our mission." The people have always been "precipitated into revolution," and "lashed into madness." And this, too, in a document which, in its opening paragraph, purports to be a manifesto to posterity; an appeal to the collective and impartial opinion of mankind is the verdict of history, whose judicial sentence is only less terrible than that of the last day. We will obey his summons before the dread tribunal, and purge ourselves of the calumny which has been heaped upon our good name.

Even this is not all; having proscribed and put us under the ban of eternal infamy, he would kindle with his eloquence the present resentment of an entire nation, that we may perish in its flame. He translates the Constitution, that great charter of civil freedom, into a grant of absolute

dominion to an imperial despot; and, having consolidated all power at Washington, he would consolidate all opinion, from the Tennessee to the St. Lawrence, to become the minister of summary vengeance. Stone is laid upon stone in the solid masonry of his argument; but as the huge pyramid rises before us, it is only to become the sepulchre where the last hope of American liberty is to be laid at rest for ever. We must tell him the day has not yet come for these sad obsequies to be performed. Seven States love republican institutions too well to surrender without a struggle the sacred inheritance; and, while he is shouting for an empire, we will contend for a republic. Assuredly, whatever else this secession movement may or may not accomplish, it has sounded the knell of despotism on this continent, and rendered possible the hope of transmitting the principles of republican government, which our patriot fathers toiled and bled to achieve. These sentences will, perhaps, sufficiently indicate the general tenor of this reply, as partly apologetic—partly expository.

Dr. Breckinridge prefers the charge of anarchy with equal vehemence against the Abolitionism of the North, and the Secessionism of the South, a couple generally lashed together in his unsparing invectives. As to the former, we abandon it to his tender mercies. May his eye not pity, nor his hand spare! Under his scorching anathema, may it wither to its deepest root! But the application of this term to the South is against the testimony of stubborn and flagrant facts. He does not indeed trouble himself much to define the terms which he bandies about so profusely, and only by inference can we gather what he precisely intends by this opprobrious epithet. On page four, he describes it as "working unto the disintegration, the morselment of all things;" and on page five, somewhat more rhetorically, as "the spirit which tramples under foot those institutions which every where have been esteemed most sacred, and every where despises the most venerable

and the most cherished traditions of our country and of our race." Nothing of all this is true of the seceding States. In the exercise of a prerogative which has always been claimed, and for what they deem sufficient cause, they have simply withdrawn from the old Confederacy and established a government of their own. We do not discuss at this moment the nature of that right, or the sufficiency of that cause; it is enough to say that their right to secede was no new pretension, advanced under the pressure of an emergency, but was always claimed as a prerogative of sovereignty. In this aspect of the case, the mere fact of secession does not, even *prima facie*, sustain the charge of lawlessness. Whether justifiable or not, the step was taken, not against law, but in accordance with a law which was deemed by the parties both fundamental and organic.

If we consider, further, the *manner* in which secession was accomplished, not a sign of anarchy appears; every step was in conformity with constitutional requirements, both in letter and in spirit. The people in each State were assembled in solemn Convention, called in due form, and with due deliberation. The election of delegates was free and untrammelled, without the machinery of caucuses, or the intervention of wire-working politicians. Ordinances of secession were duly framed, debated, adopted and signed, with almost a religious solemnity. Chosen delegates convened, after the manner of our fathers, with authenticated commissions, in a united Congress. A provisional government is immediately formed, adopting, almost without change, the old Constitution of the Union. With reasonable dispatch a permanent Constitution is framed, still upon the model of the old, with only such modifications as were necessary to adjudicate the principles lying at the bottom of this controversy, and to purge, as far as practicable, the intolerable abuses and corruptions which, under the old *regime*, had crept in through a per-

verted and subtle interpretation of that venerable instrument. This new Constitution is remanded to the respective States; and at this moment is being submitted to the ratification of the sovereign people in those States, in such manner as they themselves shall determine. Where in all this is "the morcelment of all things," that has been spoken of? If there be disintegration, it is not through the separation of the atoms in the mass, but by simple cleavage between adjacent laminæ. The law of cohesion still obtains between the people which make up an entire sovereignty, and these entire sovereignties separate for the express purpose of reintegrating in a new and happier union. Dr. Breckinridge is mistaken in supposing this political change to be "the disintegration of every healthful force of society." It is rather the recuperative power of indwelling life, throwing off disease, and resuming health—it is but the moulting of the eagle, putting on a brighter plumage, and springing upward from its eyrie to a bolder flight.

Since secession has taken place, what sign of anarchy has appeared in those States which have adventured its perils? With completely organized State governments, each has moved steadily forward, and life, honor and property have been as safe as under the broad shield of the Union. All lines of business have been pursued as before, scarcely a jar being felt in the transition. Notwithstanding the letters with which the country has been flooded, from mythical correspondents, describing the depreciation of property, the ruinous extent of taxation, and a general reign of terror, we venture to affirm there has been more repose in the seven Cotton States than in all the rest of the country beside. With the exception of more than usual military stir, in evidence of preparation to bide the worst that might come, and with the exception of a certain amount of financial embarrassment, arising from the political confusion of the country, there has been nothing to

distinguish this period from the calmest moments of the past.

During the long anterior conflict which has terminated in secession, what manifestation has the South made of the spirit which "tramples upon sacred institutions, and despises cherished traditions?" Through forty years she has been loyal to the Constitution, earnestly contending for rights which were in that bond, and battling against usurpations which were not there. Never, in a single instance, trespassing upon the rights of others, she has only succeeded in maintaining her own, through a vigilance which has never been permitted to slumber. Her contentment with the Constitution, and complacency in its provisions, are illustrated in her cordial readoption of it, and the reverence with which, under the new Government, she has placed it again within the ark of testimony. Nay, the very changes which have been introduced into that sacred document move in a direction precisely the reverse of anarchy. The extension of the Presidential term—the ineligibility to a second term—the removal from office of subordinates only for certain specified causes—the reference of these to the Senate—the liberty given to members of the Cabinet to discuss their measures upon the floor of either house, for ever dispensing with party organs—the practical provision for convening the States when necessary, without resorting to revolution to obtain redress—we discuss none of these points, but simply state they betray any thing else but a tendency to anarchy, if there be any definite meaning attached to that word. So that, whether we look at the secession movement in the *act*, or in the *manner*, whether in the *history subsequent*, or in the *history antecedent* to it, the charge of lawlessness can not be sustained, until a new dictionary of the English language shall be framed. The sole foundation of this charge lies in his conception of the American people as fused into one solid, granulated mass, which now appears to be crumbling

into atoms. We may not anticipate here the discussion of that point. His idolatry of the empire—that great image of Nebuchadnezzar, set up on the plain of Dura—is disturbed; shadows are passing over the old glory of the past; and he can see no wisdom in arrangements that are not stereotyped in the world of that past. Anarchy, with him, is simply change, a departure from the existing order. But all change is not anarchy; nor is every uprising of an indignant people in defence of chartered rights to be denounced as insurrection. This can be maintained only upon principles which would have made him, in 1776, a tyrant in England and a Tory in America.

Dr. Breckinridge is in grievous error upon other points besides this of anarchy. We allude to his account of the origin and spread of secession, the objects at which it aims, and the motives by which it has been prompted. His statement, gleaned from different parts of the pamphlet, is, that it took its rise in the "chronic hatred of South Carolina to the National Union"—(p. 9)—that it "was propagated from her by concerted action through an organized party, which succeeded in precipitating State after State into secession; while the masses of the people, stunned by the suddenness and vehemence and thorough organization of the movement, were borne along by it"—(p. 23). His conviction of this is so firm that he warns the country not to accept "this exaggerated and disloyal opinion of the extreme South, as irrevocably fixed"—(p. 40)—and builds the hope of future reconstruction upon the reaction which is certain to ensue—(p. 11). He further charges upon secession that it has ulterior designs to accomplish, beyond those which are avowed—(pp. 7, 9). He more than intimates that the design of the South to make slavery universal is as strong as that of the North to banish it entirely; this being "the shocking conception" they have formed as to the mission of the American people—(pp. 12, 34, 36). He further charges that the lust of power is the controlling motive of

the seceding States; "power to be diminished by remaining in the Union, and to be incalculably increased by leaving it; and that this idea, far more than disgust that the North has condemned slavery, or any apprehension that slavery will be disturbed, has precipitated them into revolution"—(p. 14). Finally, he denounces the seizure of the forts, public arms, the mint, and other national property, as plunder and robbery—(pp. 37, 39). This is a heavy indictment, and the specifications are minute. We propose to substitute authentic facts for these fictions, which are the coinage of a fertile brain, or else have been received with a credulity unworthy of a philosopher.

We deny that South Carolina has ever been actuated by so base a sentiment as "hatred of the Union;" especially, a hatred that is "chronic." Her statesmen and her people did, indeed, despair of the Republic sooner than others. With that penetration into the working of secret and potential causes which seems intuitive, Mr. Calhoun long since announced the catastrophe that has occurred, with a precision which now looks like the inspiration of prophecy. But that she has ever been disloyal to the Constitution, is historically untrue. During the Revolutionary struggle, overlaid by the British forces, she passed through unparalleled sufferings; and contributed her full proportion of blood and treasure to the common cause, as the numerous battle-fields which dot her soil abundantly show. From that day to this, in all her country's battles her sons have stood nearest to the flashing of the guns, always prodigal of life, whether amid the hammocks of Florida, or upon the plains of Mexico. In the more quiet walks of civil life, she has taken her share in the public councils, and borne her fair proportion of the public burdens, however oppressively distributed. Even in the memorable conflict of Nullification, for which she has endured long reproach, she was battling for the Constitution, and for the equal rights of which it was the bond. Upon that Constitution she

stood then—upon that Constitution she stands still—and in her departure from a faithless Union she bears it into a new sanctuary, the Palladium of liberty. But, when all hope of safety had died within her, she stood calmly under the shadow of the Capitol, before the clock which silently told the Nation's hours, and which would ere long sound the knell of its destiny. No sooner was this heard in the shout of Black Republican success, than she leaped, feeble and alone, into the deadly breach. History has nowhere upon her records a more sublime example of moral heroism. Ignorant whether she would be supported, even by her sister across the Savannah, relying on nothing save the righteousness of her cause and the power of God, she took upon her shield and spear as desperate and as sacred a conflict as ever made a State immortal. It is just this heroic devotion to principle, this faith in the right and the true, this singleness of heart in the presence of duty, and this abiding trust in the power and righteousness of God, that render her capable of a thousand martyrdoms, and incapable of political bondage. It is just this combination of attributes, crowning her with such moral dignity, that draws to her worn hill-sides and barren pines the "untravelled hearts" of her sons; who, in all their wanderings, from the tropics to the pole, breathe no more fervent prayer than in death to sleep upon her faithful bosom until the awful day. Her accusers prejudge their own cause, when it is alleged that such a State can hate the Union. If it were true, it is only because that Union had become the synonyme of tyranny. But the breath of slander will pass over her fame as upon a burnished mirror—a moment dim—then brighter than before. The Genius of history has already wreathed the garland with which her brow shall be decked. Long may she live, the mother of heroes who shall be worthy of their birth!

The allegation, too, that the policy of secession has been "dictated" by South Carolina to the other six States, is

simply preposterous. If it were a matter of policy at all, she has enjoyed no such prestige as a political leader as to make it safe for her to venture upon its "dictation;" and the prejudice entertained against her, as "the irrepressible little State," would, under ordinary circumstances, have been a weight upon the movement. The fact is, it has not been a question of calculation and simple prudence in any one of the States—but of stern and absolute necessity—a conflict for life, "to be, or not to be." It is unstatesmanlike in the last degree to refer an agitation so deep and wide-spread to the superficial causes hinted in this pamphlet. It is no transient storm upon the sea from the blowing of an east wind, but it is the deep ground-swell of the ocean, heaving its waters upon the main. If ever there was a movement "spontaneous and cordial among the popular masses," this was one. We are not in the counsels of the Democratic party, to know whether its disruption at Charleston was (as Dr. Breckinridge takes on him to assert) "an act of deep intention, designed to produce exactly what has followed"—(p. 23)—but we do know that, if it were, then have their most sanguine expectations been surpassed. We do know that, after this disruption, the popular masses embarked with all their usual interest in the Presidential canvass, each voter hoping to save the Union by the election of a conservative ticket—that upon the sixth of November these masses went to bed as firmly attached to the Union as they had ever been, and awoke on the seventh, after Mr. Lincoln's election, just as determined upon resistance to his rule. The revolution in public opinion was far too sudden, too universal, and too radical, to be occasioned by the craft and jugglery of politicians. It was not their wire-dancing upon party platforms which thus instantaneously broke up the deep foundations of the popular will, and produced this spontaneous uprising of the people in the majesty of their supremacy; casting party hacks

aside, who shall have no control over a movement not having its genesis in their machinations.

The division of opinion at the South between coöperation and secession is greatly over-estimated, when vaticinations are based upon it of a speedy and certain reaction. It was simply a difference of opinion upon subordinate and collateral points; nothing more. It has never shaped itself into parties, and even as an opinion, the distinction is now almost entirely cancelled. The Coöperationists from the beginning averred—and their subsequent acts sustain the declaration—that secession was with them, as with others, the ultimate remedy. But they preferred to reach this great conclusion by successive steps. They preferred to justify the South at the bar of history, by offering to the North an ultimatum, which yet they did not expect to be accepted. They desired all the slave States, as they were involved in a common peril, after mutual conference, to move together in unbroken phalanx; both as a precaution against the contingency of civil war, and as a method of securing consideration to the new Confederacy. We shall certainly not discuss the wisdom of these suggestions. That is now a perfectly dead issue, and the disclosures which have since been made, alike in the deliberations of the Peace Conference, and in the Federal Congress at Washington, have probably more than satisfied them in acquiescing in the course which was actually pursued. If proof was needed that this difference of opinion related only to immaterial issues, it is the heartiness of this acquiescence. Certain it is, that no sooner were the Ordinances of Secession actually passed than Coöperationists stood shoulder to shoulder with extreme Secessionists, and have proved the most unflinching advocates of the new Government. The evidence is absolutely overwhelming, that, since its inauguration, the secession movement has been drawing deeper every day, and public opinion has drifted rapidly against the possibility, or even desirableness, of a

reconstruction. If there be a predestinated reaction—which Dr. Breckinridge seems to decree—he must sit longer on the mount of observation than did the prophet of old, before he shall see the sign of its coming.

The charge of "ulterior and concealed designs" is handled with a delicacy that altogether surprises us. Dr. Breckinridge is rarely satisfied to puncture with an inuendo. He always employs the genuine weapons of war, and would not be suspected of a resort to the stiletto. Why, then, does he take up this allegation so gingerly upon his fingers, as though it had thorns to prick him? In his Fast-Day Discourse—which, though the briefer, is far the abler document of the two—he significantly asks the people of Kentucky, "Do you want the slave trade reopened? Do you want some millions more of African cannibals thrown amongst you, broadcast throughout the whole slave States?" This, then, on the fourth of January, was one of the "ulterior designs" of secession. Was it the recollection of this splendid prophecy, unexpectedly spoiled by the Congress of "the Cotton Confederacy," in the interdict of this traffic by an organic law, that renders him now suddenly prudent—contenting himself with generalities that can not presently be falsified? In that same discourse, he continues his interrogatories to the people of Kentucky: "Do you want to begin a war which shall end when you shall have taken possession of the whole Southern part of this Continent, down to the Isthmus of Darien?" Perhaps this is the bugbear now haunting his prophetic dreams. Well, there may be some thing here, for we see the wise men at Washington proposing to the powers of Europe a gracious protectorate over Mexico against the ambitious schemes of the Infant Republic; and benevolently hinting to Spain our very dangerous proximity to Cuba, a sugar-plum that Louisiana especially would like to swallow, in better security of her own great staple. Who knows but there may be in the midst of us military adventurers, as there

are in all lands, who are ambitious of making history a little prematurely? We know not how to quiet these nervous forebodings, but by suggesting that the South has notoriously been content to walk in historic paths. In all the long battle about slavery, we have planted ourselves upon history, as well as upon revelation. We have implored the North to look upon the whole subject as a question of history, and to leave it to history for solution. We have not the prescience of the prophet to forecast the distant future. We are content to deal with present realities, and leave the future to posterity, when it shall become their present. This has always been our position—nothing more, nothing less. Of all nations upon earth, we are the last to go poaching upon the inheritance of our neighbors. With the motto "*noli me tangere*," inscribed upon the banner of our defence, every instinct of self-preservation, as well as every sentiment of public decency, restrains us from military oppression; and the world may rest satisfied that in our waters, at least, the buccaneer can not find his sheltering cove. If we desire territory, we will not, with school-boy greed, pluck the apple when it is green, but will wait upon history till the time of ripeness, when it shall fall into the lap. But insinuations admit no reply. Our author is lawyer enough to know that no indictment crouched in generalities can lie in any court.

The transition is easy to his pathetic lamentation over the pious degeneracy which makes the universal extension of slavery the mission of the American people—(pp. 12, 34, 36). Was a purer fiction ever coined before? Where, in all the productions of Southern writers, political or religious, will Dr. Breckinridge find this thesis defended? Has it not always been admitted, by writers on both sides of the line, that, if African slavery exists at all, its limits must be determined by climate and soil—that precisely where it ceases to be profitable, there it will inevitably cease to exist? It is alone for this we have been contend-

ing—that, in the language of Mr. Webster, slavery may be left to be determined by nature and God. The simple statement out of which this great story of the three black crows has grown, is this, that slavery having come, in God's providence, to be the inheritance of the South, thoroughly interwoven with every fibre of society, and giving the very complexion and form of our civilization—and the historic moment having arrived, at the close of more than a Peloponnesian war, for concluding the conflict for ever—it is therefore the duty of the South, in the discharge of a great historic trust, to conserve and transmit the same. She must bravely rebuke the presumption which undertakes by legislative enactment to restrict that which can only be determined by God Himself, in the outworking of His providential purposes; and she must set over against it a claim of right to go wherever the providence of God shall choose to have it go. We have never said that it was the mission of the whole American people to extend it any where. We have never said that it was the mission of the South to do nothing but labor for that extension; but simply that, in the great impending crisis, the South would be recreant to every obligation of duty, and to every principle of honor, and to every instinct of interest, if she did not effectively contradict and rebuke the insufferable arrogance of those who assume into their hands the prerogatives of Divine legislation. If this offends the pious sensibilities of our brethren all over the land, we take occasion to say it will require some thing more to overthrow it than a holy exclamation.

With real pain we read the next specification against the South, of being actuated by the lust of power. In a penny paper, this would not have surprised us; but we expect generosity from the brave. It betrays a want of statesmanship to overlook the real causes of a great popular movement, and to base a political remedy upon motives which are purely fanciful. Why will not Kentucky and

the world believe the constant averment of the seceding South, that she has acted under the conviction of an amazing peril, and from a sense of compelling justice? Through nearly a half a century a party has been struggling for political rule, in sworn hostility to that institution upon which the life and being of the South depend. It has grown through all opposition, until it has imbued the public mind of the North with a kindred, though somewhat restrained, abhorrence of slavery. It has laid hold upon all parties as instruments of its will; and now at length, subordinating the Republicans as its pliant tool, it has throned itself upon the chair of State, and speaks with the authority of law. We need not go through all the details of a long and too familiar story, and recite the utterances and disclose the platforms of the dominant party now represented in the occupancy of the White House. What was the South to do? Submission at this stage would have been submission for ever; and since this was impossible without the surrender of all that a people can hold dear—liberty, honor, and safety—she simply, and, as we think, with great dignity, withdrew from the disgraceful and destructive association. Yet, while struggling thus for life itself, she is stigmatized by such a man as Dr. Breckinridge, with a base lust of power, or peevishly resenting the loss of a political control which she can not hope to recover.

It is certainly strange that a motive sufficiently strong to unite seven States in the solemn act of secession from the Union should never have combined them whilst in that Union; for it is notorious, upon all questions of public policy, the South has ever been found divided into parties, and arrayed often against herself. How does this fact—true up to the very date of secession—comport with this grasping ambition, which suddenly relinquishes all the traditions and advantages of the Federal Union, that she may vent her spleen for the loss of dominion? How does this allegation further consist with the exemplary patience with

which she has endured a system of revenue legislation, flagrantly and systematically discriminating against her, and in favor of the North? But the abundant fertility of her soil has enabled her to grow rich, even whilst contributing two-thirds to the revenue of the Government. Not for causes like these did she care to rupture the bonds of association which linked the whole country together. There is just so much truth as this in the charge now tabled against her. The South has looked with increasing alarm at the great increase of power at the North, by the addition of new free States; well knowing this power was destined to be wielded to her destruction. This she had reason to dread, and if, amongst the possible contingencies of the future, the question of reconstruction should be opened to debate, the South, unless she be given over to judicial blindness, will enter into no union in which the balance of power is not in some way preserved between the two sections. She will scarcely again hazard her all by trusting to a paper Constitution, without an effective provision, whether by a dual Executive, or by a perpetual equilibrium in the Senate, or by some other expedient, against the lawless will of an unscrupulous majority. She has preferred the better way of secession, and of a separate Government. Having long borne the burden of unequal taxation, it was proposed she should sustain that of political subjection also. The time had not come for her to accept the lot of Issachar, that "of a strong ass crouching between two burdens."

The truth of history must be vindicated, touching the seizure of forts and other national property, alleged against us as acts of spoliation and robbery. Let it be remembered that nothing of this sort was initiated until Major Anderson, under cover of night, spiked the cannon of Fort Moultrie, and threw himself into the impregnable fortress opposite to it in the harbor of Charleston. We have nothing to say of this as a piece of military strategy,

except that it changed at once the status of the two parties in this controversy. We have no anathemas to hurl against this gallant officer; for, his act being endorsed by the Cabinet, all censure is transferred from the subaltern to the principal. But the significance of this movement could not be mistaken. It meant coercion. The intolerable outrage was meditated of turning the batteries, which had been erected for the defence of the harbor against a foreign foe, upon the very people on whose soil they had been built. Instantly, upon the electric wires the conviction flashed throughout the South, that they were dealing with an imbecile and treacherous Government, which could not be trusted on its own parole. As a matter of simple self-defence, forts were seized, with all the public arms to be found within their domain. But at this very time of seizure, it was proclaimed by State authority that the proprietorship of the United States was distinctly recognized, that the seizure was intended only to prevent an unlawful and monstrous perversion of these munitions of war to their destruction, and that in final negotiations with the other party, the whole should be accounted for as the property of the entire country.

Precisely so with the mint at New Orleans. Money is the sinew of war; and Louisiana resolved the Federal Government should not draw from these coffers the means of her own subjugation. What then? She first takes a faithful inventory of all the mint contained, places the same on file, and publishes it to all the world. She then passes a special ordinance, through her Convention, by which the seal of the State is impressed upon this as a sacred deposit, held in trust, to be accounted for even to the uttermost farthing, in the final reckoning. We have private knowledge of the fact, that of this money, she has already paid out large sums upon drafts of the Government at Washington, to meet their public contracts. Under this exposition, what becomes of the charge of gross immorality

preferred against the seceding States? We smile in sadness over the recklessness of party zeal which draws a good and great man under the censure—"*honi soit qui mal y pense.*"

But enough of apology. Having disposed of these allegations, the severer part of our task remains, in the discussion of the theory which Dr. Breckinridge advances concerning the nature of our Government. The fundamental fallacy pervading his entire argument is the misconception that it is a consolidated popular Government, instead of being a Congress of Republics. It is this which gives point to his charge of anarchy—it is this that enables him to define secession as sedition and rebellion—it is this view of the case that drives him, in logical consistency, and against the better impulses of his heart, to advise a coercive policy, tempered with as much forbearance as may consist with a due enforcement of the supreme law. Here, then, is the πρωτον ψευδος of the pamphlet: and our defence of the South is incomplete, if we spare the refutation it demands. We are well aware that the controversy is as old as the Constitution itself, and has at various periods enlisted the ablest minds of the country, who have canvassed the subject both in popular speeches and in the calmer productions of the closet. But the pressure of this grave crisis, and the nature of the assaults made upon us, compel the reopening of a discussion which might well be thought closed up and sealed for ever. In proof that we do not misrepresent our author's position, consider the emphasis with which he speaks of this "great nation," and dwells upon the unity of its life—(pp. 11, 12). "We constitute," says he, "one nation, whose people, however, are divided into many sovereign States"—(p. 31). "It is a political falsehood that the people of a State are citizens of the United States only through the Constitution and Government of that State"—(p. 38). This is brought out still more articulately in his Fast-Day Discourse, which in a

note is assumed as a part of the argument of the essay in the Review. "No State," writes he, "in this Union ever had any sovereignty at all, independent of, and except as they were *United* States. When they speak of recovering their sovereignty—when they speak of returning to their condition as sovereigns, in which they were before they were members of the Confederacy, called at first the United Colonies, and then the United States—they speak of a thing that has no existence; they speak of a thing that is historically without foundation." Again: "as United Colonies they were born States." "So born that each State is equally and for ever, by force of its very existence, and the manner thereof, both a part of this American nation, and also a sovereign State of itself." "The people, therefore, can no more legally throw off their national allegiance, than they can legally throw off their State allegiance; either attempt, considered in any legal, in any constitutional, in any historical light, is pure madness."—(Discourse, p. 8.) From these quotations it is evident Dr. Breckinridge does not use the term nation in a loose popular sense, to signify a body of people, inhabiting the same country, speaking the same language, deduced from the same origin, and recognizing substantially the same laws; but in the fixed political sense of a people fused into one common and solid mass, who are merely distributed into States, for the convenience of local government. His conception, therefore, of the nation, is primary; that of States, secondary and derived. The relation of the people to the central authority is immediate, and not as they are the people of the separate States. While, in a sense which it would be difficult to define, sovereignty is ascribed to the latter, it is not original and independent, but only as they are born in and under the Union; out of connection with which, they would have none. Consequently, separation from the Union is simply *felo de se.* We do not remember ever to have seen a more complete inversion of the facts of history

to sustain an *a priori* theory. The discussion narrows itself down to a single point. There is no dispute upon the fact that sovereignty, the *jus summi imperii* resides in the people. But the dispute is, whether this sovereignty resides in the people as they are, merged into the mass, one undivided whole; or in the people as they were originally formed into colonies, and afterwards into States, combining together for purposes distinctly set forth in their instruments of Union. Dr. Breckinridge maintains the former thesis; we defend the latter; and in the whole controversy upon the legal right of secession this is the "*cardo causæ.*"

What, then, is the testimony of history? We find the first Continental Congress, at New York, in 1765, called at the suggestion of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, and composed of deputies from all the Colonial Assemblies represented therein. We find, in 1773, at the instance of the Virginia House of Burgesses, the different Colonial Assemblies appointing Standing Committees of Correspondence, through whom a confidential communication was kept up between the Colonies. We find the votes in the Continental Congress of 1774, at Philadelphia, cast by Colonies, each being restricted to one only. We find in the celebrated Declaration of Independence, in 1776, "the Representatives of the United States, in general Congress assembled," publishing and declaring "in the name and by the authority of the people in these Colonies." We find the Articles of Confederation, matured in 1777, remanded to the local Legislatures, and ratified by the several States—by Maryland, not until 1781. The circular in which this form of confederation was submitted, requests the States "to authorize their delegates in Congress to subscribe the same in behalf of the State," and solicits the dispassionate attention of the Legislatures of the respective States, under a sense of the difficulty of combining in one general system the various sentiments and interests of a Continent divided into so many sovereign and indepen-

dent communities." * We recite these familiar facts to show that during the first period of our history, embracing the revolutionary struggle, the people were accustomed to act, not as an organic whole, but as constituting separate States, and combining for common and specified ends. Indeed, it could not be otherwise. Upon throwing off their allegiance to the British crown, and the sovereignty reverting to themselves, they were not destitute of a political organization through which to act. They had existed as organized, though not independent, communities before. What more natural, in their transition to new political relations, than to stand forth the communities they actually were? As separate Colonies they had been dependencies of the British Crown: when that dependence was thrown aside, in whom could the original sovereignty reside, but in the people, who were now no longer Colonies, but States —in which form of existence the people are first presented to our view. The fact that they combined against a common foe, and to secure their independence together, does not impeach their inherent sovereignty. It remains perfectly discretionary with them—that is, with the people, as States—to determine how much of this sovereignty they will retain, and how much they will surrender, in the arrangements afterwards made. In the language of Chief Justice Jay, quoted by Mr. Story, "thirteen sovereignties were considered as emerging from the principles of the Revolution, combined by local convenience and considerations—though they continued to manage their national concerns as '*one people.*'" We accordingly reverse Dr. Breckinridge's proposition; we are not "one Nation divided into many States," but we are many States uniting to form one Nation.

But let us see how the matter stands from the period of the old Confederation to the adoption of the present Con-

* Story's His. of the Confederation.

stitution, in 1787. When the former was found to be breaking down from its own imbecility, and the necessity of a more perfect union was becoming apparent, it is curious to see how the pathway was opened through the almost accidental action of State Legislatures. In 1785, commissioners were appointed by the States of Virginia and Maryland to form a scheme for promoting the navigation of the River Potomac and the Chesapeake Bay. As they felt the need of more enlarged powers to provide a local naval force, and a tariff of duties upon imports, this grew into an invitation from Virginia to the other States to hold a Convention for the purpose of establishing a general system of commercial relations—and this, at length, at the instance of New York, was enlarged, so as to provide for the revision and reform of the articles of the old Federal compact. Thus grew up, by successive steps, the Convention which met at Philadelphia in 1787, by which the present Constitution was drafted, submitted to Congress, as the common organ of all the States, and by it referred for ratification to these States respectively. Here we have the same great principle of the sovereignty of the people, as they are States, clearly recognized. The tentative efforts towards improving the interior commercial relations of the country, are initiated by two State Legislatures; by a third, a Convention of Delegates from all the States is suggested; and the new Constitution is finally debated and ratified by separate Conventions of the people in each—North Carolina withholding her assent till 1789, and Rhode Island till 1790. This historical review seems, to us, conclusive of the point in hand. The people—not as one, but as thirteen—revolt from the English yoke; because only as thirteen, and not as one, did they ever owe allegiance. The people—not as one, but as thirteen—unite to carry on a defensive and successful war; granting to the Continental Congress just the powers they saw fit—neither more nor less—as their common agent. The people—not

as one, but as thirteen—prepare and adopt Articles of Confederation, under which they manage their common concerns for seven years. And finally—not as one, but again as thirteen—they frame and adopt a permanent Constitution; under which they have lived for seventy years, and have grown from thirteen to thirty-four. But suppose the two dilatory States, which withheld their assent to the Constitution for two and three years, had withheld it altogether—What then? Why, says Dr. Breckinridge, "they would have passed by common consent into a new condition, and have become, for the first time, separate sovereign States."—(Disc., p. 8.) Yes, truly, if by "*separate*" he only means isolated; but not separate in the sense of being *distinct*. But he has denied sovereignty to any State, "except as they are *United* States." How, then, shall these two States, who, by supposition, refused to be united, become sovereign? "By common consent," says Dr. Breckinridge, "they will pass into that condition." But on what is this common consent to be based? Why not coerce them into Union, if the people is one Nation, and these States are fractions of that unit? Certainly it is just because their refusal to concur would be an exercise of sovereignty, and it must needs be recognized as such. Yet, if the *refusal* to concur would be an act of sovereignty, then, by equality of reason, was their *agreement* to concur an act of sovereignty. In either case, the people of these two States—and so of all the others—were antecedently and distinctively sovereign; and hence, could not owe their sovereignty to the Union which they themselves created. It is reasoning in a circle, to say that the States are sovereign only as they are *United* States, when by the force of the term, as well as by the express testimony of history, they are united only by a Union which is created in the exercise of that sovereignty. We commend this fact to the attention of Consolidationists; that two States did, for the term of three years, delay to come into the

Union under the Constitution, although they were previously in it under the Confederation. It clearly proves that the people formed the Constitution as States, and not as a consolidated Nation: and that these States were not merely election districts, into which the one Nation was conveniently distributed—but were organized communities, invested with the highest attributes of sovereignty, which they exercised again and again, by and through their supreme Conventions. If as States they could legally refuse to come into the Union, why may they not as legally withdraw from it? Upon the law maxim, "*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*," this attribute of sovereignty remains, unless in the instrument it can be shown to be explicitly resigned.

It is plain, then, that before and at the adoption of the Constitution, the States were independent and sovereign. Have they ceased to be such by their assent to that instrument? Or, is the Federal Union simply a covenant between the people of these States for mutual benefits, and under conditions that are distinctly entered into the bond? Let us see. Much stress is laid upon the use of the words, "the people," in the preamble of the Constitution—conveying, it is alleged, the idea of an undivided nationality. It is, however, a plain canon of interpretation, that particular terms are to be explained by the context in which they occur. This preamble further states, that "we the people," are "the people of the United States;" a title evidently intended to embody the history of the formation of the Union as a *Congressus* of States, which, by aggregation, make up one People. In proof of this, it is a title simply transferred from the old Confederation, when no one denies that the States were separate and independent. This fact is conclusive. As the Nation is formed by the confluence of States, a periphrastic title is given, which defines the character of this nationality, as not being consolidated, but federative. It is not a little

remarkable, that no other title is employed throughout the Constitution, but this of "United States;" the composition of which, historically, describes confederation, and discriminates against consolidation. How does it happen, if the idea of a nation, as composed of individuals, simply districted into States, is the fundamental idea, not only that a baptismal name was withheld which should embody that conception, but that, on the contrary, a composite title was given, which marks precisely the opposite?

Let us now pass from the vestibule, and examine the frame-work of the Constitution itself. The first section of Article I. vests the Legislative power in a Congress, consisting of two Chambers, a Senate and House of Representatives. In the latter, population is represented. But what population? the people of the Nation as a unit, or the people of the States? Unquestionably, the latter: for Section 4 provides that "the time, places, and manner of holding the election shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof." Should a vacancy occur, "writs of election are to be issued by the executive authority of each State." Thus the States, individually, direct the election, and count and declare the vote. Plainly, this is done by the States, either as mere election districts, or else as organized communities, in the exercise of a supreme right. In addition to what has already been urged, the fact of apportioning these Representatives to the States respectively, according to the population of each, concludes against the theory that the people are fused into the mass, and determines for the idea that, under the Constitution, as before its adoption, the people represented are the people of the States in Congress assembled. In the Senate, the case is still clearer, for these States are represented as such, all being placed upon the same footing, the largest having no more power than the least. If we turn to the Executive branch of the Government, the President and Vice President are chosen by the people, indeed, but still

by the people as constituting States. The electors must equal in number the representation which the State enjoys in Congress; and they must be chosen in such manner as each State, through its Legislature, shall determine.—(Con. Art. II.) Should the election fail with the people, it must go into the Congressional House of Representatives, with the remarkable provision, that the "vote is there to be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote." Why so? if not to forestall the possibility, through the inequality of the States in that Chamber, of a President being chosen by a numerical majority merely, without being chosen by a concurrent majority of the States? We submit to the candor of the reader, if these constitutional provisions are not framed upon the conception that the people are contemplated as States, and not as condensed into a Nation. If this latter were the fundamental idea, could arrangements be made more effectively to conceal or to cancel it?

But it is urged that, in the adoption of the Constitution, the States have remitted, in great part, their sovereignty; and have clothed the General Government with supreme authority in the powers they have conferred. "Congress shall have power," says the Constitution (Sec. 8, Art. I.), "to levy and collect taxes, to regulate commerce, to coin money, to declare war, to negotiate peace," and the like; all which, it is alleged, are the acts of a sovereign. Precisely so: Congress shall have the *executive power;* but the Constitution does not say the *inherent right.* The distinction between these two goes to the bottom of the case, and will clear up much prevalent misconception. The people of the States have not parted with one jot or tittle of their original sovereignty. According to primitive republicanism, it is impossible they should do so. It exists unimpaired, just where it always resided, in the People constituting States. But these States, sustaining many relations to each other and to foreign nations, concur to manage those

external matters in common. In their confederation for this purpose, they create an organ common to them all. To that agent they confide certain trusts, which are particularly enumerated; and that it may be competent to discharge the same, they invest it with certain powers, which are carefully defined. They consent to put a limitation upon the exercise of their individual sovereignty, so far as to abstain from the functions assigned to this common agent. They come under a mutual pledge to recognize and to sustain this established Constitution, *quoad* its purposes, as the paramount law. But all this by no means implies the delegation of their sovereignty to the General Government. Power is often conferred upon municipal corporations to perform certain functions pertaining to sovereignty—as, for example, the power of taxation. But who ever dreamed that these corporations became thus *ipso facto* sovereigns; or that the State, in conferring such charters, remitted any portion of its supremacy? In like manner, the several States, in granting these powers to Congress, granted them in trust, for purposes purely executive: retaining the right inherent in themselves to revoke these powers, and to cancel at will the instrument by which they are conveyed. We confess our inability to understand this doctrine of a double sovereignty: a sovereignty which, while it is delegated to the General Government, is nevertheless supreme; and a sovereignty which, while it is retained by the States as a part of their original inheritance, is nevertheless subordinate. The very terms of either proposition appear to be solecisms. Sovereignty, however limited it may be in actual exercise, is simple, and incapable of distribution. It is a still greater contradiction to speak of a sovereign who is under subjection to a superior authority. We can very well understand how several sovereignties shall unite upon schemes which can only be executed by a restraint voluntarily imposed; but not how they shall create a power that is superior to them all. Ac-

cordingly, we find the Constitution providing in its very last article for "the establishment of this Constitution"—not *over*, but "*between*—the States ratifying the same." The distinction between these two propositions is not metaphysical, but immensely practical and substantive. The first would establish the government of a superior over subjects who obey; the second establishes a common law between equals who recognize and sustain. Still more emphatic is the tenth amendment to the Constitution, which specifies that "all powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This betrays the jealousy which watched over the formation of the Union; showing the grant to the General Government to be a grant of specified and executive powers; while all the rest remains, by inherent right, with the States in their local and permanent organization, or with the people of those States in their primal and inalienable sovereignty.

This exposition of the relation of the States to the Federal Union, is confirmed by the debates in the Convention which formed the Constitution, in 1787. Aware of the weakness of the existing Confederation, it is not strange that a party arose desirous of strengthening the central power. It was urged against the new Constitution, that no tribunal was erected to determine controversies which might arise between the States and the Nation. The Supreme Court was restricted in its jurisdiction to causes in law and equity, and could not adjudicate political differences. The proposition was, therefore, submitted to extend its powers, so as to make it the arbiter of all issues that might arise. It did not, however, prevail so as to be articulated into the Constitution. Of course, the States were thrown back upon the great principle of international law, that every sovereign must decide for himself in controverted issues, under a sense of responsibility to the opinion of mankind, and the verdict of impartial history.

To show still further the relation of the States to the Union, we will cite another fact. Three resolutions were introduced into the Convention, the first declaring "that a Union of the States *merely federal* will not accomplish the objects proposed by the Articles of Confederation;" the second, "that no treaty or treaties between the States, as sovereign, will secure the common defence;" the third, "that a *national* government ought to be established," * etc. The first two resolutions were immediately tabled; the third was adopted; but afterwards, in the course of debate, undue stress being laid upon the word "national," it was changed into "the government of the United States."†

Another method was proposed, to provide for the danger of collision between the Federal and State authorities. The sixth of Gov. Randolph's famous fifteen resolutions, empowered "the Federal Executive to call forth the force of the Union against *any member of the Union*, failing to fulfil his duties under the articles thereof." ‡ This suggestion utterly failed to secure the assent of the Convention, and the resolution was abridged as to this feature of it. The strongest Centralists in the body, as Mr. Madison and Mr. Hamilton, repudiated the principle, as tantamount to a declaration of war and a dissolution of the Union, and utterly repugnant to the genius and spirit of this Government. We can not burthen this article with the citation of authorities. These general facts are sufficient to show the view taken by the framers of the Constitution, as to the relations between the States and the central authority. They are of no little significance, at a time like this, when so many are clamoring for the coercion of the South, whether it be a *coercion of laws* or a *coercion of arms*. The puerile distinction had not occurred to these wise men of a past age, between coercing a State and the coercion of its citizens alone: a distinction perfectly legitimate, when

* Elliott's Debates, Vol. I., p. 391. † *Ibid.*, p. 427. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

a State professes to recognize the authority of the Union, and unlawful combinations of individuals exist to resist the same; but a distinction utterly impertinent, when the State asserts her sovereign jurisdiction over her citizens, and disclaims any longer participation in the Federal Union. Manifestly, if a State, while in the Union, may not be coerced by federal power, without its "being tantamount to a declaration of war;" then, *ex fortiori*, she may not be coerced, when by her sovereign act the bonds have been sundered by which she was held under the compact, and she stands wholly without the pale of the Union.

The longest argument must have an end. We advert, finally, to the notorious fact, that in the very act of ratifying this Constitution, three States asserted their sovereign right to resume the powers they had delegated. New York declared "that the powers of government may be reassumed by the people whenever it shall become necessary to their happiness:" * and further indicates what people she means, by speaking, in the same connection, of the residuary power and jurisdiction in the people of the State, not granted to the General Government. The delegates from Virginia "declare and make known, in the name and in the behalf of the people of Virginia, that the powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, may be resumed by them, whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury and oppression." † In like manner, Rhode Island protests against the remission of her right of resumption. And while the language is not so explicit as that of New York, the meaning is precisely the same; for, as the original grantor of these powers was the people of the States, and not the collective people of the country at large, the former alone had the right to reassume. The other States made no such declarations. Indeed, as the right lay in the very nature and history of

* Elliott's Debates, Vol. I., p. 327. † *Ibid.*

the federation, they could be made by these three only in the way of superabundant caution. This right, so solemnly asserted seventy years ago, has been sleeping upon the records of the country. It is now brought into exercise by seven States, and the issue can no longer be blinked. If the insane advice gratuitously tendered in this pamphlet should be followed by the Federal authorities, the war that ensues will be a war of principle as well as of passion: and the South will know that she is contending against tyranny in theory, as well as tyranny in practice.

It would thus appear the doctrine of withdrawal from the Union is not so novel as it has been supposed by those who scout it as monstrous. Let us see if it has not made its appearance more than once in the history of the country. When Mr. Jefferson was made Secretary of State, after his return from France, he was warmly importuned by Mr. Hamilton to throw his influence in favor of the assumption of the State debts, in order to save the Union from threatened dissolution. "He," says Mr. Jefferson, "painted pathetically the temper into which the legislature had been wrought; the disgust of those who were called the creditor States; the danger of the *secession* of their members, and the separation of the States;" * which was only averted by bringing over two of the Virginia delegation (White and Lee) to support the measure. At a later period, the passage of the Embargo Act, it is well known, inflamed the New England States to the highest degree; so that on the floor of Congress it was declared, "they were repining for a secession from the Union." In the Hartford Convention, at which five of the Eastern States were represented, the report which was adopted uses the following language: "Whenever it shall appear that these causes are radical and permanent, a separation by equitable arrangement will be preferable to an alliance by constraint among nominal

* Irving's Life of Washington, Vol. V., p. 61.

friends, but real enemies, inflamed by mutual hatred and jealousy," etc. Again: "In cases of deliberate, dangerous and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a State and the liberties of the people, it is not only the right, but the duty, of such a State to interpose its authority for their protection, in the manner best calculated to secure that end. When emergencies occur which are beyond the reach of the judicial tribunals, or too pressing to admit of the delay incident to their forms, States, which have no common umpire, must be their own judges, and execute their own decisions." It is a little curious that these avowals of the right of secession should come from the very section which is most chargeable with begetting the present schism: and that the very people now most ready to arm themselves for the coercion of the South could plead for an equitable and peaceful separation, so long as it was meditated by themselves. The infamy attaching to the Hartford Convention springs not from their exposition of political doctrine, but from the insufficiency of the cause impelling them to a breach of compact, and from the want of patriotism which could meditate such a step when the country was in the midst of a war with a foreign enemy.

We have thus argued the legal right of secession, without touching upon its moral aspect. Regarding the Union in the light of a compact, it is not lightly to be broken. Framed for such purposes, and under such circumstances, it was a covenant peculiarly sacred, which could not be set aside without guilt somewhere. In this regard, the seceding South is prepared to carry her cause before the world, and before God. When the Union had failed in all the ends for which it was instituted—neither "establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquillity, promoting the general welfare, nor securing the blessings of liberty;" when these delegated powers were perverted into powers of oppression and injury; when the compact had flagrantly, and with

impunity, been broken by the other parties to it; then it became the South to assert her last right, that of a peaceful withdrawal from the partnership. If to her other wrongs this last and most atrocious of them all, an attempt at her forcible subjugation, is to be added, then will her defence be as complete as an injured people ever carried over to the judgment of posterity. On this, however, we will not enlarge. It will be seen that, upon the legal aspects of the question, we are at antipodes with the writer, whose essay we have reviewed. He affirms the people to be one, divided into many: we, that they are many, united into one. He ascribes sovereignty to the Union: we, to the States. He regards the Constitution as creating a government which is *over* the States: we regard it as a common law established *between* the States. In his view, "any attempt to throw off this national allegiance, in any legal, in any constitutional, in any historical light, is pure madness:" in our view, in every legal, constitutional, or historical light, there is no allegiance to be thrown off, and consequently there is no madness in the case. He affirms secession to be rebellion, which must be suppressed at every hazard: we, that it is an inherent right of sovereignty, which can not be disallowed without an international war. Let the reader put the two into his own scales, and decide for himself.

We rise from this discussion under the profound conviction that the separation of this country into two governments was inevitable: simply because, from the beginning, two nations have with us been in the womb—and the birth, however long delayed, must come at length. From its very formation, two antagonistic interpretations of the Constitution have prevailed, which have just been presented in contrast. The final issue would naturally be deferred, as this and the other struggled for the ascendency. But whenever, through the expansion of territory, and the consequent increase of patronage, the political prizes should

become too great for the virtue of our people; and whenever sectional jealousies should arise, springing from different forms of society, and opposite systems of labor, the time has arrived for deciding whether the Federal Executive is a *servant* or a *sovereign*. Had the former view prevailed, the Union might have been perpetual. Had the Constitution been regarded as a compact whose bonds were mutual honor and good faith, the apprehension of a rupture would have been the surest guarantee of its observance. The very feebleness of the bond would have been its strength, as the exquisite sensibility of the eye constitutes the greatest protection of that organ. The predominance of the opposite theory has wrought the existing anarchy of which our author so loudly complains. Just because the States have been regarded as provinces, which, if rebellious, could be dragooned into submission, the North has been tempted, through its numerical majority, to sectional aggression; from which, under the other view, it would have been restrained by every consideration of honor and interest. Dr. Breckinridge, in his zeal against anarchy, has not preserved us from despotism, towards which this country has already made fearfully rapid strides. We have always admired the gigantic scale upon which his shadow has ever been cast. It has been no mean proof of his transcendent genius, that in the display of even the smallest weaknesses of our nature, he has ever succeeded in redeeming them from contempt, and of lifting them almost into the sublime. So now, when he would provide for the final destruction of this Republic, it is upon a scale of grandeur that would make her fall only second to that of ancient Rome. We will not recall to his memory the steps by which that grand Republic slipped into an Empire; nor how the legions of Gaul, or of the East, or the Pretorian Guards at home, elevated successively their puppets—until the distant barriers were swept over by barbarian hordes, burying all civilization beneath the flood. But we will

remind him that one Rome is enough for one World. With her instructive history before him, let him not push this Republic forth upon the same career, first of imperial grandeur, and then of a disintegration that will prove universal and frightful. We are not anarchists upon a scale like that. We are conservative enough to reef the sails of our ship before she drives upon the rock, and founders in the sea, with the loss of her treasures. We will put out the long-boat, and separate in time to save and perpetuate those republican principles which are dear to our hearts.

We wish the reader to observe that, whenever the question comes up for decision, whether this is to be a Republic or an Empire, this country is obliged to split in two parts. This question happens to have mixed itself up with that of slavery, the issue upon which a sectional party has succeeded in carrying the Government by assault. But if there had not been an African on this continent, this political difference must sooner or later have worked out the result which has occurred. Dr. Breckinridge is to all intents an imperialist. He has gone off upon the old notions of former ages, which doom this Republic to be a failure—and a failure the more stupendous the longer it should happen to last. If there be no other bonds holding these States together but those of central force and coercion, then, with all our boasting, we have solved no problem in politics, and made no contribution to history. But our conviction is, that the American problem is being worked out for good, and not for evil. The future historian will look back upon this movement of secession as the movement which rescued the whole country just as it was slipping into an empire—an empire to be shattered at last, after the manner of all the empires of the earth—and least of all to be endured upon this continent, where it is an utter apostacy from the political faith of our fathers.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

In consequence of the crowded state of our pages, and the delay which has already occurred, we are compelled to postpone all notices of books until our next issue.

ARTICLE VII.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS.

I. *Danville Quarterly Review*, March, 1861; Explanatory Note. Article I. The Relative Doctrinal Tendencies of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism in America. II. The Relation which Reason and Philosophy sustain to the Theology of Revelation. III. The Mystery of Iniquity. IV. Our Country—Its Peril—Its Deliverance. V. Immortality of the Soul. VI. Ulphilas. The Goths and their Language. VII. Nature and Revelation in Relation to the Origin of our Conception of a God. VIII. Divine Sovereignty manifested in Divine Predestination—the only Security for the Use and Success of Means. IX. Critical Notices.

II. *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, January, 1861. Edited by Charles Hodge, D. D. Article I. The State of the Country. II. Antiquity of the Book of Genesis. III. The New Oxford School; or Broad Church Liberalism. IV. The Fulfilment of Prophecy. V. Liverpool Missionary Conference of 1860; or, Results of Missionary Experience. VI. The Alexandrine and Sinaitic Manuscripts. Short Notices.

III. *New Englander*, January, 1861. Article I. China and the West. II. The Maronites and the Druzes. III. Solar Phenomena. IV. The Design and Nature of Punishment under the Divine Government. V. Does Science Tend to Materialism? VI. Latin Pronunciation. VII. Puritan History. VIII. The Pulpit and the Crisis. IX. Notices of Books.

IV. *DeBow's Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Mr. Clements' "The Rivals"—Burr and Hamilton. II. Growth and Decay of Nations. III. Cuba—The March of Empire and the Course of Trade. IV. National Characteristics—The Issues of the Day. V. Table Talk—Sydney Smith—Coleridge—Luther. VI. The Non-Slaveholders of the South. VII. Chotank, Alexandria—A Dive into Herculaneum. VIII. The Secession of the Cotton States. IX. Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry. X. A Plan of Present Pacification; or, a Basis for Reconstruction of the Union, if it be Dissolved. Department of Commerce. Department of Miscellany. Editorial Miscellany.

V. *DeBow's Review*, March, 1861. Article I. The Pioneers, Preachers, and People of the Mississippi Valley. II. Eikon Basilike—Now as Then. III. French Revolutionary History. IV. What is a Constitution? V. One Idea. VI. School Life and Its History. VII. The Dead Languages. VIII. Density of Population. IX. The English Language. X. The Grape—Its Culture and Manufacture at the South. XI. The Southern Confederacy. XII. Practical Geology of Louisiana. Department of Commerce. Department of Internal Improvements. Department of Manufactures and Mining. Department of Agriculture. Department of Miscellany. Editorial Miscellany.

VI. *United Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Edited by David R. Kerr. Article I. Philosophical Theology. II. Forbearance. III. The Ruling Elder. IV. Tractarianism Traced to its Sources. V. The Theology of Art. VI. The Settlement of the Reformed Churches in Western Pennsylvania. VII. Individual Effort. VIII. The Second Assembly. IX. Short Notices.

VII. *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Paganism a Demon Worship. II. Laurentius Valla. III. The Inward Light. IV. The Hebrew Language and Literature. V. Evangelism of the Eighteenth Century. VI. Literary and Theological Intelligence. VII. Notices of New Books.

VIII. *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, January, 1861. Article I. Education for the Ministry. II. Recent Anglican Philology. III. Philosophic Import and Value of the First Chapter of Genesis in its applications to Organic Nature. IV. Cleveland's Text Books. V. Philosophy of Representation. VI. Introduction of Children into the Church VII. Apparitions of the Dead. VIII. The Rev. Littleton Fowler. IX. Brief Reviews.

IX. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Edited by D. D. Whedon, D. D. Article I. Methodism after Wesley's Death. II. Annihilation. III. Another New Hymn Book. IV. The Prayer of Habakkuk. V. Dean Swift. VI. The Use and Abuse of Eyesight. VII. Godwin's History of France. VIII. Foreign Religious Intelligence. IX. Foreign Literary Intelligence. X. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. XI. Quarterly Book Table.

X. *Christian Review*, January, 1861. E. G. Robinson, Editor. Article I. Macaulay's Essays. II. Infant Baptism; its origin traceable to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. III. The Sensibilities. IV. The Inspiration of the Apostles. V. Conant's Matthew. VI. Roman Orthoepy. VII. Study of International Law. VIII. Notices of Recent Publications. IX. Theological and Literary Intelligence.

XI. *Mercersburg Review*, January, 1861. Edited by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., and Rev. P. Schaff, D. D. Article I. The Epistle to the Galatians Translated and Explained. II. The Marvellous in Modern Times. III. English Versions of the Heidelberg Catechism. IV. Our Alumni Association. V. Recent Publications.

XII. *Evangelical Review*, January, 1861. Edited by C. P. Krauth, D. D., and others. Article I. The Laborer, the Artisan, and the Artist. II. Chiliasm critically examined, etc. III. The Ministerium. IV. Baccalaureate Address. V. The Master's Call to His Church. VI. Notices of New Publications.

XIII. *Theological and Literary Journal*, January, 1861. Edited by David N. Lord. Article I. Mr. Gascoyne's Theory of the Apocalypse. II. Dr. Barth's Travels and Discoveries in Africa. III. Reply to the Errors and Misrepresentations of J. R. Blake. IV. The Golden Image, Daniel iii. Nebuchadnezzar's Vision of the Tree, Daniel iv. V. Designation and Exposition of the Figures in Isaiah, chapters lxi., lxii., and lxiii. VI. Literary and Critical Notices.

XIV. *Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy*, January, 1861. Article I. Interesting and Successful Experiments in the Treatment of Convicts. II. The Application of the Principles of Reformatories to the Treatment of Adult Criminals. III. The "New York Times" on Prison Discipline. IV. Enormous Abuse of the Power of Committing Magistrates. Brief Notices.

XV. *Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository*, January, 1861. Edited by E. A. Park and S. H. Taylor. Article I. Theodore Parker. II. The Theology of Sophocles. III. The Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, and its recent Theological Applications. IV. The Christian Law of Self-Sacrifice. V. Review of Palfrey's History of New England. VI. Notices of New Publications.

XVI. *Home Circle*, March, 1861. L. D. Huston, Editor. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. General Articles. Poetry. Editorial Department.

XVII. *Southern Episcopalian*, March, 1861. Edited by Rev. C. P. Gadsden and Rev. J. H. Elliott. Miscellaneous. Poetry. Editorial and Critical. Religious Intelligence. Obituary Notices.

XVIII. *Historical Magazine*, March, 1861. General Department. Societies and their Proceedings. Notes and Queries. Notes on Books. Miscellany.

XIX. *Pacific Expositor*, March, 1861. Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., Editor. The Presbyterian on the Expositor; Our Boys in their "teens"; The Aged Pastor; Education in California; Dr. Scott's Address at the opening of the City College; Opening of the City College, from the Alta; Condemned Criminals; "Milking the Goat"; Princeton Review on the Country; Rev. Charles Russell Clarke; Afflictions Sanctified; Chaplains in the Legislature; A Prayer for the Times; California Bible Society; Rev. W. C. Mosher—Rev. J. Woods; Natural and Apostolic Intolerance; City College and its Prospects; Thanksgiving Sermons; Vice and Virtue; The National Fast; Literary Record.

II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

I. *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision. II. Japan and the Japanese. III. The Victoria Bridge. IV. Political Ballads of England and Scotland. V. Ocean Telegraphy. VI. Autobiography of Dr. A. Carlyle. VII. Motley's History of the United Netherlands. VIII. Forbes and Tyndall on the Alps and their Glaciers. IX. The Kingdom of Italy. X. Naval Organization.

II. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, January, 1861. Article I. The Political Year. II. The Purist Prayer Book. III. Uncivilized Man. IV. English Embassies to China. V. Horror: a True Tale. VI. What's a Grilse? VII. Norman Sinclair: An Autobiography.—Part XII. VIII. A Merry Christmas! IX. The Indian Civil Service—Its Rise and Fall.

III. *Westminster Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Ancient Danish Ballads. II. Alcohol: What becomes of it in the Living Body. III. Canada. IV. Bible Infallibility: "Evangelical Defenders of the Faith." V. The Neapolitan and Roman Questions. VI. American Slavery: the Impending Crisis. VII. Cavour and Garibaldi. VIII. Dante and his English Translators. IX. Contemporary Literature.

IV. *London Quarterly Review*, January, 1861. Article I. Canada and the North-West. II. The Welsh and their Literature. III. The United Netherlands. IV. The Iron Manufacture. V. Italy. VI. The Dogs of History and Romance. VII. The Income-Tax and Its Rivals. VIII. Essays and Reviews.

V. *North British Review*, February, 1861. Article I. India Convalescent. II. Shelley and his Recent Biographers. III. Large Farms and the Peasantry of the Scottish Lowlands. IV. Lord Dundonald. V. Modern Necromancy. VI. Engineering and Engineers. VII. The Political Press—French, British, and German. VIII. Home Ballads and Poems. IX. Hessey's Bampton Lecture. X. Dr. Carlyle's Autobiography. XI. Lord Palmerston and our Foreign Policy.

III. FRENCH AND GERMAN PERIODICALS.

I. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Janvier 1861: Paris. I.—Le Roi Louis-Philippe et l'empereur Nicolas (1841–1843), par M. Guizot. II.—Les Mineurs du Harz, Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans l'Allemagne du Nord, par M. Auguste Laugel. III.—De la Statistique en France et des Progrès de la Richesse Publique, par M. Charles Lavollée. IV.—Conquête de la Mer, par M. J. Michelet, de l'Institut. V.—L'Esclavage aux États-Unis.—II.—Les Planteurs et les Abolitionistes, par M. Éliséo Reclus. VI.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'espèce Humaine.—II.—L'Espèce, la Variété et la Race, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VII.—Deux Jours de Sport a Java, Scènes de la vie Indo-Hollandaise, par M. Fridolin. VIII.—Des Derniers Budgets de la France et de l'Accroissement des Dépenses, par M. Victor Bonnet. IX.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Essais et Notices.—Le Comte Téléki. XI.—Revue des Théatres, par M. É. Montégut. XII.—Bulletin Bibliographique.

II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Janvier 1861. I.—La Comtesse d'Albany. I.—Louise de Stolberg et Charles Édouard, par M. Saint-René Taillandier. II.—L'Empoissonnement des eaux Douces.—Les Poissons Sédentaires et les Poissons Voyageurs, Moeurs, Production, Elève et Acclimatation des Diverses Espèces, par M. J.-J. Baude, de l'Institut. III.—Le Général Sir Robert Wilson au Camp Russe en 1812, Souvenirs de Guerre et de Diplomatie, par M. E.-D. Forgues. IV.—Leibniz et Bossuet d'après leur correspondance inédite, par M. Charles de Rémusat, de l'Académie Française. V.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—III.—Races Végétales et Animales, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VI.—Deux Épisodes Diplomatiques. —I.—Dernières Négociations de l'Empire, Ouvertures de Francfort et Conférences de Chatillon, par M. O. d'Haussonville. VII.—Les Voyageurs en Orient.—VI.—De la Moralité des Finance Turques, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Français. VIII.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX.—Essais et Notices.—Lettre de Chine. X.—Des Récens Progrès de l'Agriculture Anglaise, par M. L. de Lavergne, de l'Institut. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.

III. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Février 1861: Paris. I.—L'Italie depuis Villafranca.—II.—Le Roi François II et la Révolution de Naples, par M. Charles de Mazade. II.—Joseph de Maistre et Lamennais.—Les Tendances Communes et les Résultats Définitifs de leur Philosophie, par M. Louis Binaut. III.—La Comtesse d'Albany.—II.—La Reine d'Angleterre et Victor Alfieri, par M. Saint-René Taillandier. IV.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—IV.—Des Variations dans les Êtres Organisés, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. V.—Les Finances de l'Empire, par M. Casimir Perier, ancien député. VI.—La Fauvette Bleue, Récit des Bords de la Loire, par M. Th. Pavie. VII.—Les Fantaisies d'Histoire Naturelle de M. Michelet, par M. Emile Montégut. VIII.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX.—Revue Musicale.—Un Ballo in Maschera, etc., par M. P. Scudo. X.—Théatres.—Les Pièces Nouvelles. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.

IV. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Février 1861: Paris. I.—La Comtesse d'Albany.—III.—L'Amie d'Alfieri et la Société Européenne, par M. Saint-René Taillandier, *II.—Hegel et l'Hégélianisme d'après les Derniers Travaux Publiés en Allemagne, par M. Edmond Scherer. III.—La Nationalité Bretonne dans l'Unité Française, par M. L. de Carné. IV.—La Télégraphie Électrique en France.—De la Réforme du Service Électrique et de l'Abaissement des Tarifs, par M. Auguste Laugel. V.—Les Voyageurs en Orient.—VII.—De la Situation des Chrétiens en Turquie d'après une Enquête du Gouvernement Anglais, Première Partie, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Française. VI.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—V.—Origne des Variétés et Formation des Races dans les Êtres Organisés, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VII.—Des Origines de la Gravure.—l'Archéologie et la Critique dans l'Art, par M. Henri Delaborde. VIII.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX.—Revue Musicale.—La Circassienne, de M. Auber, par M. P. Seudo. X.—Essais et Notices. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.

V. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Mars 1861: Paris. I.—Trois Ministres de l'Empire Romain sous les fils de Théodose.—II.—L'Eunuque Eutrope, Première Partie, par M. Amédée Thierry, de l'Institut. II.—Philosophie Anglaise Contemporaine.—John Stuart Mill et son Système de Logique, par M. H. Taine. III.—Statistique Morale.—Le Salaire et le Travail des Femmes.—IV.—L'Assistance et les Institutions de Prévoyance, Dernière Partie, par M. Jules Simon. IV.—El Cachupin, Scènes et Récit de la Louisiane, par M. Théodore Pavie. V.—Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme —Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—VI.—Du Croisement dans les Êtres Organisés, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VI.—La Nemesis Divina, Manscrit Inédit de Linné, par M. A. Geffroy. VII.—La Question du Coton en Angleterre depuis la Crise Américaine, par M. John Ninet. VIII.—Portraits Poétiques.—Maurice de Guérin, par M. Émile Montégut. IX.—Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X.—Essais et Notices. XI.—Bulletin Bibliographique.

VI. *Revue Germanique*, par MM. Ch. Dollfus & A. Nefftzer, 15 Janvier 1861: Paris. Sommaire: I.—L'Ame de la Plante (deuxième et dernier article), par M. A. Boscowitz. II.—Le Saule, nouvelle, par M. Ch. Dollfus. III.—La Corse, traduit de l'allemand de M. Ferdinand Gregorovius. IV.—Un Mois de Séjour a Vienne, par M. A. Widal. V.—Les Travaux de F. C. Baur: Idée générale des origines et des premiers développements du Christianisme, par M. A. Nefftzer. VI.—Bulletin Bibliographique et Critique. VII.—Courrier Scientifique et Littéraire. VII.—Chronique Parisienne.

VII. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Décembre 1860: Paris. Sommaire: La Tragédie fataliste en Allemagne, A. Monnard. Félix Neff, Martin. Saint Jean Chrysostome, A. Eschenauer. Une mission en Chine et au Japon, Ernest Lemaître. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois, E. de Pressensé.

VIII. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Janvier 1861: Paris. Sommaire: Les Moines et le Christianisme, E. de Pressensé. Milton, sa vie et ses Écrits, E.-H. de Guerle. Un nouveau plan d'éducation, Gauthey. Etude sur le Cantique des Cantiques, Godet. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois, Eug. Bersier.

IX *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Février 1861: Paris. Sommaire: Ce qu'il faut a la France, Rosseeuw St-Hilaire. M. de Tocqueville et l'Académie Française, E de Pressensé. De la Prédication Catholique.—Le P. Lacordaire, E.-H. de Guerle. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois, E. de Pressensé.

X. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Jahrgang 1861 erstes Heft. Abhandlungen. 1. Hupfeld: noch ein Wort über den Begriff der sogenannten biblischen Einleitung. 2. Weiss: zur Entstehungsgeschichte der drei synoptischen Evangelien. Gedanken und Bemerkungen. 1. Ritschel; über die im Briefe des Judas characterisirten Antinomisten. 2. Kamphausen; Bemerkungen über einige Stellen des vierten Capitels der Genesis. Recensionen. 1. Lücke, Commentar über die Briefe des Evangelisten Johannes; rec. von Wieseler. 2. Gass, Geschichte der protestant. Dogmatik; rec. von Kling. Miscellen: Programm der teyler'schen theologischen Geschellschaft für das Jahr. 1860. Zweites Heft. Abhandlungen. 1. Bleek, Erklarung von Jesaja, 52, 13–53, 12. 2. Richter, die Kindertaufe, ihr Wesen und Recht. Gedanken und Bemerkungen. 1. Steitz, der classische und der johanneische Gebrauch von ἐκεῖνος. 2. Gurlitt, kleine Beiträge zur Erklärung des Evangeliums Matthäi. Recensionen. 1. Pressel, Ambrosius Blaurer's Leben und Schriften; rec. von Ullmann. 2. Maier, Commentar über den ersten Brief Pauli an die Korinther; rec. von Holtzmann. Kirchliches. Mühlhäusser, die Unionskatechismen. Miscellen: Programm der Haager Gesellschaft zur Vertheidigung der christlichen Religion auf das Jahr 1860.

ERRATA.

The reader is requested to correct the following errors of the press, (in Article V.,) which happened during the author's absence from town:

On page 129, line 14th, for *Valer*, read *Vater*. In line 18th, for *christalization*, read *crystalization*. In line 22d, for *Præ Elohist*, read *Præ-Elohist*. In line 5th from bottom, for *Mouboddo*, read *Monboddo*.

On page 132, line 11th, for *Ewoge*, read *Ewige*.

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 2.

JULY, MDCCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

NATURAL HISTORY AS A BRANCH OF SCHOOL EDUCATION; AND THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE UNIVERSITY, IN RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO ACTIVE LIFE.

In our article on the Principles of a Liberal Education, (Vol. XII., p. 310,) as also in an Inaugural Address delivered by us, we endeavored to show the importance of *organic science* as a means of mental culture. In our article on Morphology, (Vol. XII., p. 83,) we undertook to point out the philosophic connection of that branch of organic science with fine art. Finally, in our article on the Relation of Organic Science to Sociology, (Vol. XIII., p. 39,) we attempted to explain the philosophic connection of the same science with the most important concerns of life. If there is any truth in any of these views, (and we are perfectly confident there is,) the great importance of a full introduction of organic science into our courses of liberal education becomes evident at once. Our college curriculum, therefore, requires modification in this respect. It is in vain to contend that other equally or more

important departments would have to be partially displaced. If the object of liberal education is symmetrical culture, and if the different departments have correlative functions, and are, therefore, essentially complementary to one another, as we have attempted to show in the article on the Principles of Education, before alluded to, then it is of the utmost importance that the various departments should be *all* introduced, and properly adjusted. Profound, accurate and special knowledge of any department, however important in a practical point of view, is far less important in a liberal education than a good fundamental knowledge of all.

It is true that mathematics and classics, as the basis of the whole scientific and art course, may be considered the most important departments in a general culture, but it is not necessarily true that importance, in the sense of *indispensableness* should be the measure either of prominence or of dignity. A course of education is an *organized* system. It may be, therefore, compared with other *organisms*, and is subject to their laws. Now, the functions of the animal body may be divided into two great classes, viz: those which are the *means*, the necessary *condition* of animal life, and those which are the *end* and *object* of animal life, and give dignity to it. To the first class belong digestion, respiration, circulation, nutrition, and all the so-called vegetative functions; to the second belong the distinctive animal functions, such as locomotion, and the exercise of the higher senses. Now, which of these two classes is the most important? Evidently, the first, since upon it depends the very life of the animal, and, therefore, the existence, of the second class. But which is the noblest? Evidently, the second, since these functions constitute the true end and object of animal life, and, therefore, the first class exist only for them. The various pursuits of men may be similarly considered as functions of the social body, and may, therefore, be similarly classified. There are those which are the necessary means and condition of social life—the vege-

tative functions of the social body—*e. g.*, the trades, commerce, and all the so-called useful pursuits of men. There are others, which are directly connected, not with the existence, but with the end and object, of social life, and without which social life will have utterly failed of its true mission, viz: the spiritual elevation of man. These are all pursuits which have for their object the attainment of Truth, Virtue, Beauty. Of the tree of social life these are the flower and fruit, as the first are its trunk and roots. Of the temple of society these are the capitals and pinnacles, as the others are the firm foundation and the solid walls. Of these two classes, again, evidently the first is the most important, but the second the noblest. In proportion as society advances, the first becomes subordinate to the second.

Now, each subordinate course of the college curriculum is or ought to be an organized system, and, therefore, subject to the laws of other organisms. The several departments may be, therefore, classified in a somewhat similar manner, though the classification is by no means so obvious, because the organism is less perfect. Mathematics forms the basis and necessary condition of scientific culture, as organic, and especially social, science does of its true end and object. In the art course, classics bear the same relation to literature and the fine arts. If each lower department had no other significance than as a basis for the next higher—in other words, if the organism was complete—then it is evident that, in a general culture, so much and no more mathematics would be required as is necessary to form a solid foundation for physics and chemistry; so much physics and chemistry as is necessary for a clear apprehension of organic science, and so much organic science as is necessary to a thorough knowledge of social science and psychology. In an ideally perfect condition of human philosophy, such would, indeed, be the ideal of general culture. But in the present very imperfect condition of human

knowledge, particularly in these higher departments, each lower department must be not only a means, but an end, in itself, of culture; and until now their function as an *end* is even more important, perhaps, than as a *means*. In proportion, however, as the higher departments are more developed—in proportion as the sum of human knowledge becomes more perfectly organized—in the same proportion must the educational course become more perfectly organized, and, therefore, the lower and simpler departments assume the position of a foundation and the function of a *means* of culture. They must decrease as the others increase. Now, it seems to me that the developement of our educational systems have by no means kept pace with the organization of knowledge—that in the lower departments much is insisted on which is not absolutely necessary in a *general* culture—an amount of minute knowledge, and, therefore, an amount of time, is required, which was well enough when no other formal or organized culture was possible, but now belongs rather to a *special* than a *general* culture.

If, then, the recent rapid advance and great importance of the higher departments be admitted, there can be no doubt that our curriculums of education should be modified to suit these new conditions. Organic science, especially, should be more largely introduced into our college curriculums. But there are difficulties in the way of the successful introduction of this department, which in the present state of our educational systems are absolutely insuperable—difficulties which only increase in proportion to the conscientiousness of the teacher, and his appreciation of the nature of true culture. Perhaps many will think that the subject is as yet unadapted to systematic teaching; but a little reflection will suffice to show that the chief difficulty lies not in the nature of the subject—which is eminently adapted to excite the interest, to kindle the enthusiasm and expand the mind—nor in the unorganized condition of the science

itself, but in the faulty and unorganized condition of our educational systems.

In order to show the true nature of this difficulty, let us compare organic science with some one of the simpler and more perfect departments of science. In the present state of our educational systems, perhaps, of all departments of science, natural philosophy is capable of most completely successful teaching, and organic science is cumbered with most difficulty. The reason of this difference is easily explained. In teaching natural philosophy, the facts and phenomena—the things about which the science treats—are *already familiar* to the pupil. Uniform, accelerated and retarded motion, falling bodies, centre of gravity, levers, pulleys, wedges, screws, inclined planes, winds, rains, dew and frost, clouds and storm, thunder and lightning, the more obvious phenomena of light and sound, as reflection, refraction, dispersion, etc.—all these have been forced upon his attention during childhood, as the necessary result of the simple exercise of his senses. If there are a few phenomena which are still unfamiliar—such as those of electricity and magnetism—these may be easily given in a very few and simple experiments. Thus the *things* about which we are to reason are already familiar, and the reasoning, and the study of *principles* and *laws* may commence at once, and be carried on with entire success.

In astronomy there is more difficulty. Already there are a number of unfamiliar facts which must be learned, (such as the motions of the heavenly bodies,) before the study of laws, or the science proper, can be commenced. These, however, may be learned without much loss of time. In chemistry we first enter a field in which the facts and phenomena, and even the things about which we are to reason together, are utterly unfamiliar to the pupil. We are about to learn a language the alphabet of which is not yet known. Oxygen, hydrogen, chlorine, nitrogen, as well as almost all the substances spoken of by chemistry, are new things—

their properties entirely unknown until the pupil enters the chemical lecture-room. Hence, a very large amount of time is necessarily consumed in becoming acquainted with the mere *raw material* of science, before that material can be woven into the *fabric* of science. Hence, to teach the science of chemistry with thoroughness and success, requires an amount of time much greater than can be spared from other and equally important departments in the college curriculum. Already the difficulty is beginning to press heavily. But when we come to organic science and geology, the difficulty reaches its acmé. In these sciences the number of facts, most of them unfamiliar, is so enormous—even the objects concerning which we are to reason are so entirely new, and so infinite in number and variety—that much more than the whole time which can be well spared from the curriculum would be required to master them, and no time at all is left for the science proper. Thus, only one of two alternatives is left open to the teacher: Either to attempt to teach the laws and principles with an exceedingly slender and imperfect knowledge of the objects and phenomena upon which these laws and principles are based, or else to consume the whole time in an attempt to master the details, and never ascend to laws and principles at all; either to attempt to interest the mind and exercise the reason, by explaining the significance of things yet too imperfectly known, or else to stuff the memory, "against the stomach of the sense," with the dry detail of facts which have no significance; either to call up a mere *skeleton* of facts, and then try to "create a soul under the ribs of death," or else to make a *body* out of the dust of the earth, and breathe into it no breath of life; in a word, either to teach a science without a natural history, which must precede it, or else to stop with natural history, and never ascend to science at all. In the one case we imitate the folly of him who built his house upon sand; in the other, of him who laid deep the foundation, and built nothing thereon. The

effect of the one is to unsettle the mind by unsatisfactory and unsubstantial knowledge; of the other, to disgust the pupil, and degrade the noble science of organisms, by crowding the mind with details when it should be occupied with principles—exercising the memory only, when we should exercise the reason also—stuffing the memory with the husks of *facts*, when we should be nourishing the mind with the invigorating aliment of *truth*.

Such being the difficulty, how is it to be removed? We are sure it has already suggested itself to the reader's mind. The only difference between the simpler and the more complex sciences, in respect to success in teaching, consists, as we have seen, in the fact that in the one the things and phenomena are already learned in childhood, while in the other they are not. Evidently, then, organic science can never be successfully taught in college, unless a large number of facts in this department be first mastered in childhood. And as these will not be spontaneously acquired, they must be *taught* in our common schools. In a word, *before organic science and geology can be taught in our colleges with a thoroughness and success at all commensurate with their importance, natural history must be largely introduced into our preparatory schools.*

Thus it has happened, that, by reflecting on the great importance of organic science, and yet the difficulties attending its successful introduction into our college curriculum, we have been led to reflect upon the philosophic relation of school education to college education, and thence upon the relation of both to university education, and all to active life—through a train of thought connected with a particular department, to a question of general interest—from a question in a special philosophy to a question in general philosophy. We hope in the sequel to show the significance of this fact.

There is a growing, and, we believe, a thoroughly rational tendency at the present day to look upon all artificial clas-

sifications and systems as essentially vicious, and to make nature, rightly interpreted, the true basis of every system. A course of education, therefore, in order to be successful, must be a reflection of the course of developement of the human mind—a true expression of the order of developement of the human faculties. It would be difficult, and perhaps useless, for our present purpose, to trace this order in all its details; but there are great groups of faculties or departments of the mind, which unmistakably culminate and decline successively. This fact we have attempted, in our article on the Relation of Organic Science to Sociology, to generalize, under a law which we have called the law of "cyclical evolution." For illustrations of this great law of all developement, we would simply refer to that article; suffice it for the present to say, that in childhood the perceptive faculties and memory take their rise, culminate and gradually decline; in youth culminate the impulses, the passions, the emotions, and the imaginative faculty; at the same time takes its rise, and in manhood culminates, the rational faculty, or formal reason, or, as it might otherwise be called, the scientific faculty, or faculty of *organizing* knowledge. Or the relation between these three stages of developement may be otherwise expressed, thus: childhood is the period of culmination of the perceptive faculties, as manhood is of the rational faculty. With the decline of the one, the other takes its rise, thus forming two arches, the chasm between being spanned, and the continuity of developement maintained, by the imagination and æsthetic faculty. Thus, youth is the *transition stage* between childhood and manhood, as the imagination forms the connecting link between the strictly perceptive and the purely rational faculty.

This, then, being the order in which the faculties of the mind *naturally unfold*, it must be the only order in which they can be successfully *cultivated*. The best human education is not that which forces the faculties into unnatural

and premature growth, but that which cultivates to the fullest extent the several faculties as they naturally and successively arise—*i. e.*, the perceptive faculties and memory first, and the rational faculties afterwards. We have all of us observed instances of the disastrous results of a contrary course. We have all observed that, as a general rule, the too prematurely *thoughtful* child is not most likely to make the most eminent and useful man; that, on the contrary, the boy in whom the characteristic *childish* faculties are most strongly developed—the boy fullest of life and keen interest in the external world—of the keenest eye, the quickest ear and the readiest mother-wit—in a word, the boy who is more boyish than other boys, is most likely to make a man more manly than other men. There is a *tide* in the developement of the mental faculties, which, taken at the flood, leads on to the highest culture, and to greatness. Childhood is the flood time of the perceptive faculties and the memory—the golden opportunity for gathering rich stores of detail-knowledge of things through the senses, and retaining them by the memory—an opportunity which never occurs but once. Youth and early manhood is the rise and flood time of the reasoning faculties. We must seize this opportunity of cultivating these to the full: if we seize it not, it is gone for ever. Alas! for those who neglect this only opportunity. The careless, thoughtless joyousness of childhood, opening its young eyes upon a beautiful world, as it were, fresh from the hands of God; the warm emotions and glowing imagination of youth, through which, as through a prism, the world seems so variously and gorgeously colored—alas! these must decline; it is the inexorable law of developement. If we go not forwards, we go, inevitably, backwards. If the culmination of the higher intellectual and moral faculties do not succeed to these, the whole nature, both physical and mental, degenerates—the beauty, the freedom, the splendor, of youth sinks into the coarseness of manhood—glorious

hopes and noble aspirations are exchanged for selfish worldliness. Ah! who has not seen this melancholy process of retrogradation going on constantly? There is some thing always touching, engaging, beautiful, in childhood and youth, even without culture. But without intellectual and moral culture, there is neither interest nor dignity, nor even physical beauty, in manhood. But, alas! in woman, how much sadder is often the change, unless culture takes the place of the free joyousness of youth! Who has not seen and mourned over the sad change which marriage often makes in the characters of women who neglect culture? Instead of the charming maiden expanding into the noble matron, she sinks into the querulous household drudge, or the heartless devotee of fashion. Where, now, are all her tremulous hopes, her tender longings, her ardent aspirations after the ideal? Gone for ever! All these sweet swelling buds, just ready to burst into bloom, to fill the air with fragrance, and rise as grateful incense to Heaven, withered and shrivelled beneath the icy touch of the hard realities of life, and only the scentless calyx leaves remain—all the glorious promise of spring sinking suddenly into an untimely winter sleep. "Some times, when a long buried idol of her once devout heart, or a strain of melancholy music, throws upon this winter sleep of her heart a warm sunbeam, she starts and looks around, and says, 'Formerly was it different with me, but it is long, long since, and I believe at that time I might have erred'—and she sleeps again."

But to return. If childhood is the flood time of the perceptive faculties and the memory—the golden opportunity for gathering stores of material—how important that this omnivorous, indiscriminate appetite for knowledge—this immense capacity for gathering and retaining material—should be turned in the right direction. We have said above that natural history belongs to the school, and organic science to the college. We now generalize this fact into the

proposition that there is *in every department a corresponding division, with similar educational functions.* In every department there is a part which corresponds to natural history, and a part which corresponds to natural science. The one is occupied with the details of facts and phenomena, the other with laws and principles; the one with things, the other with ideas; *the one exercises preëminently the perceptive faculties and memory, the other preëminently the formal reason.* There is no general name by which these two divisions are designated, for the plain reason that they have been imperfectly recognized. In default of a better, I shall call them natural history and natural science, or simply History and Science. We have already indicated the two in natural philosophy, astronomy, chemistry and organic science. In geography, they are—1st. Ordinary geography, both political and physical, as taught in the schools—*i. e.*, the detail-knowledge of the features of the earth's surface; and, 2d. Geographical science, or the laws and causes of these features. The first is the anatomy of the earth; the second, the morphology and physiology of the earth. In history they are—1st. History as ordinarily understood—*i. e.*, the details of history; 2d. The philosophy of history—political economy and social science. In the language department they are—1st. Knowledge of *formal rules* of grammar—of lexicon, and practice in translation; 2d. The science of language, *the laws* of grammar, and the study of the literature of the ancients. In art they are—1st. Manual dexterity and knowledge of technical details and rules; 2d. Æsthetics. Now, the great and fundamental difference between the school and college curriculum consists in the fact that *history* belongs to the *school*, and *science* to the *college*, using both terms in the general sense previously indicated. Thus, the school and the college do not, or ought not to, differ in the *subjects* taught, but only in the *kind* of knowledge imparted in each department. In every subject there is a part which belongs to the school and a part to the college.

Every subject should be learned twice over, once in the school and once in the college. In the one we store the memory with words and things, in the other we exercise the higher faculties of the mind, in reasoning about the things previously acquired. Thus, celestial geography and the phenomena of celestial motion, belong legitimately to school, while astronomical science belongs to college. Chemistry, so far as it refers to a knowledge of the properties of bodies, belongs properly to school, but chemical science, or the body of laws and principles founded upon these properties, belong to college. Natural history of organisms belongs to school, the science of organisms to college. Geognosy belongs to school, geology to college. Geography belongs to school, geographical science to college. History belongs to school, philosophy of history and sociology to college. The knowledge of lexicon—the formal rules of grammar, and practice in translation—belong to school, philology to college. Formal rules and technicalities of art, and acquirement of manual dexterity, belong to school, cultivation of taste—enthusiasm for art, and the study of æsthetics—belong to college. Even in mathematics the division, though less marked, is still visible. The formal *rules* of arithmetic and algebra, and the acquirement of facilty and dexterity in arithmetical and algebraic *operations*, belong to the school, while the higher mathematics, and and even the rational comprehension of these rules and operations, belong legitimately to college. Thus, if it were possible, it would be well if, on every subject, there were two series of text-books, one for schools and the other for colleges; and thus that every subject in the course of education were passed over twice. In fact, all that we have said on this subject is but an illustration of the general and indisputable law, that the mind passes always from the *concrete* to the *abstract*—from sensation and perception, to thought—from things to ideas. Now, the proposition is,

that *concrete* knowledge belongs essentially to *school*, and *abstract* knowledge to *college*.

Having thus defined in general terms the true nature of school education, as contrasted with college education, and shown that if organic science is ever to be successfully introduced into college, the natural history of organisms must first be introduced into our schools, we will now attempt further to show that the *natural history* of organisms is *peculiarly adapted* to the *cultivation of the childish faculties*, and, *therefore, peculiarly important as a department of the school curriculum.*

One of the greatest faults of our systems of school-education, from time immemorial, has been the over-crowding the memory of the pupil with dry, uninteresting detail—the over-taxing the memory, without relieving it by connection with the other faculties of the mind—thus often creating a disgust for learning which is never eradicated. This difficulty has long been felt. The tendency of the age has been to relieve this tax upon the memory, by connecting it with the formal reason. Now, in so far as this has counteracted the disastrous effects of cultivating the mere memory—so far as this connection has succeeded in giving life and interest to otherwise dry detail—it has done immense good. We can not but think, however, that it may be carried too far, and thus result in unnatural and premature developement—developement of faculties which belong to youth rather than childhood; or else that it will, in many instances, fail from a want of conformity to the laws of natural developement. It is rather by its connection with the perceptive faculties, or *intuitive* reason, and the exercise of the senses, that the memory is to be relieved in childhood. It is in youth that the connection of memory with the formal reason is most advantageous. A mere mass of unconnected facts, we all know, can not be retained in the memory, or, if retained, is but a heap of useless rubbish. Knowledge, to be of any use, must be more or less organized. In child-

hood it must be roughly and provisionally organized by the *perceptive faculties;* in youth and manhood it must be more perfectly and permanently organized by the *formal reason.* Who does not know that it is impossible to over-crowd the memory if it is stored through the senses, and the materials organized by the perceptive faculties? Now, this is just the effect of natural history in all departments of science, but particularly of the natural history of organisms. It teaches the child to see and hear, to observe and compare, and to store the memory by means of observation and comparison. The habit of seeing and hearing truly, of observing and comparing accurately—does not daily experience prove that these are among the rarest, and yet the most important, of mental gifts? In all the departments of exact science, our knowledge may be brought completely under the dominion of formal reason—may be subjected to regular rules and strict methods—and thus completely organized. But in the higher and more complex departments of knowledge, this is no longer possible. In our dealings with men, and even with nature in its most complex phenomena, the processes of the mind are far too subtle to be reducible to regular methods. The problems of exact science may be *completely solved* by the *formal* reason and the use of regular rules; but the problems of the more inexact, because more complex, departments of knowledge, can only be more or less accurately *guessed at*, by the *intuitive* reason acting through methods which can not be reduced to rule. In these departments conclusions must be reached by a process of combination so rapid and subtle, so various and complex in its successive steps, as to baffle all our attempts at analysis. This rapid intuitive perception of truth, by processes which we can not analyze, is, in fact, what is called *common sense*, or *judgment;* and in its highest developement, as in great statesmen and warriors, is genius. It is closely allied to what I have called the perceptive faculty—it is, in fact, but a higher developement of the same

thing. Now, the great value of natural history, as well as of ancient language, consists in the fact that it *preëminently cultivates this indispensable faculty of comparison and rapid combination—this noble faculty of judgment and common sense.* The mental process by which the naturalist pursues, through numberless comparisons, and finally detects, the unvarying amid the ever varying; by which he determines species, and then groups them into genera and families; eludes, by its subtlety, our powers of definition, and baffles our attempts to reduce to formal rule. The capacity may be *imbibed* by personal contact and familiar association, but can not be *formally imparted* by the teacher—the process may be learned by practice, under direction, but can not be taught by rule. Where formal reason fails, we are often compelled to *judge* of organisms by their habits, their general port, their physiognomy: as we judge of men by their faces and their actions. Thus natural history cultivates the power of observing and comparing—of rapidly combining and accurately judging—of arriving at truth which transcends the power of formal methods—and thus admirably prepares us for those still more complex and difficult problems of human actions which are daily presented to us in practical life.

If, then, this faculty of observing and comparing, of combining and judging, is so useful in practical life, how important is it that it should be not only freely exercised, but carefully trained. Exercise it will be, at any rate, since the perceptive are the predominant faculties of childhood, and, therefore, in constant use; but an untrained faculty is often worse than its entire absence—undisciplined strength is often worse than mere weakness. The latter may be harmless, the former always dangerous. The one leaves us in ignorance, the other leads us into error. We feel confident, therefore, that as a means of mental culture, no department of the school curriculum can at all compare with natural history of organisms, except the ancient languages. In this department we have the same connection of memory

with the perceptive powers, though not so much with the senses—the same exercise of comparison, though not of observation. These two, therefore, of all departments, are most eminently adapted to cultivate the characteristic faculties of childhood. Ancient language has, perhaps, the advantage of requiring severer labor, and thus cultivating the habit of patient perseverance in toil, so indispensable to the student; and, in common with the whole art course, of cultivating the faculty of expression, so indispensable to every cultivated man; but natural history has the advantage of exciting more interest, of stimulating the spirit of inquiry, kindling the enthusiasm, and feeding the flame of the love of truth.

A complete confirmation of the views above presented, as to the importance of these two departments, is to be found in observing the *method of nature—i. e.*, in watching the manner in which, and the means by which, the mind of the child unconsciously cultivates itself. There are two, and only two, kinds of culture to which the human mind is subjected by nature from the very first, and which, in imitation of nature, should be continued by art throughout life, or least until maturity, as coördinate branches of education. They are *object-culture* and *language-culture.* From the time the child opens its eyes upon the world, these two kinds of education commence. Who has not watched with intense interest the gradual but joyous, free, and healthy, developement of the mind under the influence of these two sources of knowledge and culture—the gradual acquisition of the *knowledge* of properties, phenomena and things, by the *action* of the external world upon the mind through the *senses*, and the gradual acquisition of *power* by the *reaction* of the mind, through the bodily organs, upon the external world—the gradually increasing influence of other minds upon that of the child, through language, and the gradual attempt, through the same means, to react upon and influence others? The two great natural educators are external

nature and our fellow-men—the one acting through the senses, the other through language—the one is object-education, the other language-education. From time immemorial, we have directed and improved by art this language-education. Shall we not perfect by art the object-education also?

These two, then, viz: object-culture and language-culture, are the *natural* coördinate branches of the education of childhood. To these, however, must be added, by art, mathematics. This department must be added at this time, not so much with a view to present as to *future culture.* As the necessary basis of the whole scientific course in college, it can not and must not be neglected. Still, as a means of cultivating the minds of children, I think it will be admitted by all that mathematics more often fails than any other department. The reason of this is not any special difficulty in the department itself; but because, as usually taught, it is introduced, with an eye to a future course, out of the natural order of mental developement. The mind passes always with much difficulty, and by slow degrees, from the *concrete* to the *abstract*—from *things* to *ideas.* But here we commence at once with the most abstract propositions. If the mind is prepared for these, either by nature or by previous training, it grasps them at once, and the whole mathematical course becomes extremely easy; but if not, the whole course becomes a dead waste, without a single green spot—a blank tablet, covered with curious but unintelligible symbols. Thus, mathematics is either *more* perfectly or *less* perfectly understood than any other department. There is no half-knowledge possible. It is the most uncompromising dispenser of its gifts—it either nourishes bountifully or altogether starves the mind. To him that hath five talents it gives five talents more, but from him that hath but one talent, it takes away even that which he hath. It will not yield an inch, nor stoop in the slightest degree, but requires every one to help himself.

External nature and language, on the contrary, are adapted to the capacity of every mind. They have some thing for every kind and degree of intelligence; they have their milk for babes, and their strong meats for strong men; they kindly stoop and take the feeble ones by the hand, and gently and tenderly help them onward and upward. We climb the hill of mathematics by a series of steps cut in solid rock. If the pupil's legs are too short to reach the first step, he is left behind. If in any subsequent part of the course—through carelessness or inadvertence—he misses one step, the train sweeps onward in its magnificent march, and leaves him struggling behind, unpitied, and perhaps disheartened and broken-spirited. In object-culture and language-culture, on the other hand, we ascend a hill equally lofty, but more accessible to feeble limbs; not by granite steps, but on natural soil—rugged and steep, true, but here and there a blue gentian or a moss-covered resting-place. We are not compelled to proceed "*cum æquo pede,*" by inexorable steps ready cut; but at the rate and with the steps which suit our strength, our gentle mother, Nature, the while leading us by the hand.

We have thus attempted to show the characteristics of school, as contrasted with college education. It must not be supposed, however, that it is either possible or desirable that the two courses should be trenchantly divided. We have shown the *distinctive* characteristics of each course, but they really run by insensible gradations into one another. They are, indeed, but one course, the college being but a natural developement of the school course. There are no trenchant lines of distinction in nature, especially in a course of natural developement. We speak of the distinctive characteristics of childhood, youth, and manhood; but these three stages pass by insensible gradations into one another. The proper basis of a scheme of education, is the law of developement of the human mind; and therefore, also, the several stages of a course of education must equally grad-

uate insensibly into one another. As all the faculties of the mind exist at every stage of developement, and the distinctive character of each stage consists in the relative strength of these faculties, so, also, all the faculties of the mind must be cultivated at all periods; the distinctive character of the different stages of education consisting in the predominance of one or another species of culture. The human mind is in fact an unit—the separate faculties are so indissolubly bound together that they can not be cultivated, except in connection with one another. Thus, the rational faculty is to some extent cultivated in every department of school education, but especially in the mathematics, which may, therefore, be looked upon as the representative of that faculty in the school course: While, on the other hand, the memory, the perceptive faculty, and the power of expression, is cultivated to some extent in every department of the college course, but especially in the language-art course, which may, therefore, be looked upon as their representative in the college course. The school, therefore, graduates insensibly into the college course in all departments, but especially is this true of the language and art course. In fact, it is, we think, one distinctive function of the language-art course thus to connect firmly together the school and college curriculum. We have already said that the imagination, the faculty of expression, and the æsthetic faculty, stand midway between the perceptive and the reflective, partaking of the nature of both, and binding all together into one organic whole. So, also, the art-course, which is the representative of these in the curriculum, must run through and firmly connect the school and college courses. Thus, of the three coördinate departments of the school, viz: nature, mathematics and language-art, the first, nature, is distinctly differentiated between the school and the college into *natural history* and *science;* mathematics runs throughout, but is cultivated in school principally with reference to practice in mathematical operations, and in

college, to the exercise of the formal reason; the language-art course also runs throughout, but in school cultivates principally the perceptive faculty and the memory, and in college the æsthetic faculty and the reason. Thus, the mathematical and language-courses both run throughout the whole educational course, but there is this great distinction between them, viz: that while the language-course *remains as a distinct course throughout*, mathematics, which is distinct in school, *is merged into the scientific course in college.* Nature and mathematics have no connection in school, but become *one* in college. This simplification, by the union of what was before distinct, is a law of developement of human knowledge, particularly conspicuous in the department of science, as we have attempted to show in our Inaugural, as also in our lecture on Morphology, and in that on the Principles of a Liberal Education. Here, we observe, it finds its embodiment in a course of education; but only distinctly marked in the scientific department, because only this department is completely organized. The metaphysical or philosophical course belongs, of course, exclusively to college. Thus, there are three coördinate departments, both in school and in college. Mathematics and natural history, which are distinct in school, uniting, in college, to form one, viz: science, the philosophic course being added, and the language course continuing.

We come now to the university course. The *distinctive end and object of this course is, undoubtedly, a direct preparation for active life*—a direct apprenticeship to the various pursuits of actual life. The college course looks only to the *individual* to be cultivated, without direct reference to the particular wants of *society.* It cultivates strength, symmetry of proportion, and universal efficiency. It prepares for the whole sphere of man, without reference to the particular fragment of that sphere which the necessities of material existence may hereafter compel him to choose. It is a thoroughly *human* education, and not an education for

society in its present phase. The university course, on the other hand, is a direct preparation for society in its present phase of developement—as now constituted of various classes and pursuits. It is a preparation for activity in that particular subdivision of man's sphere which the necessities of our material nature and the wants of society compel us to choose.

But it will be asked, is the university, then, a mere school of specialities? Is the object of culture purely utilitarian? Shall not the general culture, commenced in college, be completed here? Is not one object of the university to make the finished scholar? Yes, it is true that one of the main objects of the university course is to complete the general culture, and thus make the perfect scholar; but it is only as a member of *society*, as a member of one *class*, and that the highest, in a well-organized society, and as influencing society for good, that the scholar assumes his true significance and his real dignity. One of the main objects of the university is a preparation for the scholar-class—an apprenticeship to the profession of letters. The main object of the university is, certainly, the completion of a general culture; but this general culture has in the university a *special* significance which it has not in the college. It is only from this point of view that the university course assumes its true significance, not as a system of self-culture, but preparation for the noblest field of activity; only so does the scholar assume his true dignity, not as an *object*, but as an *agent*—not as a *work of art*, but as a *worker* in the field of thought—one actuated not by selfishness, even though it be the most refined, but by duty to God and his fellow-men. In fact, it is only through activity, as a member of society, by connecting the intellectual with the *moral* faculties, the *intellect* with the *will*, that the highest culture, even of the pure intellect, is attained.

There is no difference of opinion, then, as to the fact that the university should make the complete scholar. The

real difference of opinion, as to the university course, is connected with a difference of idea as to the nature of the scholar. The common idea of the scholar is either the man of learning, or else the man of polite culture—either the man of immense erudition, or else the man of general, brilliant, but superficial culture—the one has come down to us from an age servile in its admiration and imitation of antiquity, the other from a frivolous age, fond of glitter and pomp and display. But in this earnest, hard-working age, when labor in some field is the only passport to respect and the only badge of dignity, the idea of the scholar must be changed. The true scholar is the *productive worker* in the field of thought, either as *extending its bounds* or as *increasing its distribution*—either as the investigator or as the teacher. In speaking of the scholar, therefore, I speak not of him who has merely passed through and mastered the *curriculum*, but of him who has imbibed the true *spirit* of knowledge; not of him who has the form or shadow only, but of him who has grasped the substance also; not of him who has laid up in the treasure-house of his memory the thoughts of other men—whose memory is the charnel-house of dead thoughts, embalmed, it may be, in the royal cerements of noble language, yet still, to him, dead—but of him whose life is a real, living activity in the world of thought; not of him whose mind is a museum in which elegant extracts and striking thoughts, gathered hither and thither, like glittering gems, from the field of literature, are regularly arranged and carefully labelled, ready to be paraded on fitting occasion to astonish the uninitiated, but of him who has eaten of the thoughts of great men as of flesh, and imbibed of their spirit as of blood, until these have been incorporated into his very mental constitution, to reappear as a living, active principle in his thoughts, his words, his actions; not of him who dwells for ever in the outer world of appearances, but of him who has entered the inner sanctuary of knowledge, who has laid hold of the di-

vine idea of the universe—the divine which underlies all appearances—even though it be but the extreme skirts of her garment, and has said: "I will not let thee go until thou bless me."

Now, I am satisfied that the *best means of attaining this true scholarship is through exhaustive study of special departments*, and in proportion as knowledge becomes more and more perfectly organized does this attainment of a general philosophy through a special philosophy become more and more easy. The sum of possible human knowledge—the knowable—may be likened to a sphere. If we wish to attain a general philosophy, in proportion as culture is superficial, must its area be extensive. So long as we crawl upon the surface, our knowledge, however various, extensive and minute, must be fragmentary—our *learning* may be profound, but our *knowledge* will be superficial. But if we penetrate to the centre, *in any direction*, we are then in position to study the forces and causes which give shape to the whole mass. So, if through any special department, we penetrate to the inner sanctuary of knowledge, we will catch at least glimpses of the divine idea which animates the whole. Or, to use another illustration: Divine truth, descending from the throne of God, ramifies in its way earthward, dividing first into great branches, these into smaller, until the extreme rootlets are fixed in our sensuous nature. To him who dwells in this lower, sensuous plane alone, no connection between these various branches is visible—all knowledge is isolated and fragmentary. But in proportion as we ascend along any one branch, the union of some, the approximation of all, and their ultimate convergence to one centre of all truth, becomes more and more clear.

These four, then, the *primary school*, the *college*, the *university*, and the *world*, are the successive schools through which the human mind must pass in order to insure its full and perfect developement. The education in these may be

called, respectively, *primary* education, *liberal* education, *practical* education, and *activity.* Of these, the first is a direct preparation for the second, and these two together constitute the *pure* educational course, as contrasted with active life. They constitute essentially one course, having one object, viz: simple culture, but divisible into two parts, the distinctive character and mutual relations of which we have already fully considered. Again: the third is a preparation for the fourth, although the connection is not so intimate. If, therefore, we divide human life primarily into two—educational life and active life, or education and activity—the object of the one being *culture*, and the object of the other *influence*, or the imposition of that culture upon others—then the school and college are the field of the pure educational life, the world is the field of the pure active life, and the university is the transition, or *bridge*, between the two. Thus we have, again, a threefold aspect of human life, consisting of two complementary, and apparently antagonistic, halves, bound together by a third, and together constituting an organic whole. Let us show, further, the extent of this antagonism, and the nature of this connection.

Active life is also divisible into two parts. One is the action and reaction of *rational* beings, through their spiritual nature—through mutual sympathy and moral influence; the other is the mutual action of beings *material* as well as rational, upon one another, through their material nature and material wants. The one may be called *spiritual life;* the other, *business life.* The one is social life from the spiritual point of view, the other is social life from the material point of view. The one is the free activity of our spiritual nature, unconditioned, except by its own imperfections; the other is the activity of the same nature, conditioned also by time and sense—by external nature and a material body. The one has its basis in that common humanity which underlies all the fleeting forms and phases

of society; the other has its basis in those very fleeting forms and phases. Now, the educational life—*i. e.*, general culture, or liberal education—is a direct preparation for the first, but has no connection with the second, but, on the contrary, may be said to be antagonistic to it. The too great absorption of the mind of the present age in the second, or business-life, is the true ground of the hue and cry against liberal education, as unpractical, and unfitting for active life. Now, it is the great end and object of liberal education to prevent this absorption of the mind in the business-life. This it does by cultivating that common humanity which underlies and is independent of all forms of social organization—by preparation for activity in the spiritual life. The tendency of business-life, while it strengthens the material bonds, is, as we all know from sad experience, to loosen the spiritual bonds, and thus to separate the classes of society from one another. The tendency of the spiritual life, on the other hand, is to bind them together by mutual sympathy. This mutual sympathy is strengthened by liberal education, and thus society is bound more closely together into one common brotherhood.

But there is, nevertheless, a real ground of justice in the protest of the utilitarian spirit of the age against liberal education—*i. e.*, of culture for culture' sake. It is certainly true that education, in many cases, unfits for active life. It is certainly true that, in too many cases, the student, by constant living in the world of books, and having to do with at least the *forms* of ideas, gradually loses his firm hold upon the world of solid reality, and yet has failed to lay hold of the divine idea. Thenceforward he lives neither in the world of thought nor in the world of reality; but in a world of *forms* and *shadows*—the world of opinion and appearance. Thus, the more he cultivates himself, the more impenetrably does he become incrusted with dead formulæ, and, therefore, the more impermeable to the rays of truth. Thus, in too many cases, culture be-

comes an injury, instead of a blessing, to the individual. But is this peculiar to culture? Is it not so with every thing good in this world—it blesses the few and curses the many. Is not wealth a curse to most men? Does not increasing vice often come with increasing civilization? Does not increasing knowledge engender increasing skepticism? Does not the glorious Gospel itself, while it blesses unspeakably the few, harden the many? Are we to conclude, therefore, that these intended blessings have all proved curses to our race; and must we find happiness only in Rousseau's "State of Nature?" Ah, no! The few chosen in each case are the "salt of the earth." Through them the world is blessed, society improves, civilization progresses, and even those who are individually injured in one way are blessed in another, by their connection with society and with civilization—even those who become impermeable to *direct* light, may be affected by that which is *reflected* from society—even those who have not the living principle of truth itself, may be incrusted with the *form* of truth: and this incrustation of dead forms, even though it resists growth and developement, at least preserves from *decay*. Thus, each successive phase of truth is, as it were, "buried in a napkin" until the return of the Lord—embalmed until the day of its resurrection into living activity. Now this is, perhaps, in many cases, the necessary result under any system of education; but its extreme commonness is, we are sure, the result of a wrong conception of university education, and, therefore, of the nature of the true scholar. There seems to be, among cultivated men, a general impression, rather felt than expressed, that the principal object of the university is to complete the culture, for culture' sake, commenced in the college—that making the university a practical school, in any sense, degrades it—that university education is, *par excellence*, the liberal education. But we are convinced that this idea has been disastrous to the cause of true culture, and still more to the

influence of cultivated men. Such an idea only increases the antagonism between the educational and the active life, and thus removes the scholar still farther from the actual practical world. Not only so, but it can only make the pedant or the superficially cultivated—the learned or the accomplished man—but not the man of living power, or the true scholar. The fact is, we can not and must not ignore the material wants of man and the existing constitution of society in our schemes of education. The antagonism between the educational and the active life must not be carried too far; on the contrary, the antagonism must be removed, and they must be reconciled. This must be done in the university, and is, indeed, the distinctive significance of the university course, particularly of the special practical schools. It is true, also, but not to the same extent, of the university course, considered as a general culture—as an introduction into a complete philosophy—as a course intended to make the perfect scholar, or *worker* in the field of thought. We say, not to the same extent, because the scholar may be said to stand as a connecting link between the material and the spiritual man. His activity is principally displayed in the spiritual world, but only becomes efficient through his connection with an *organized* society, and as a member of a class in that society. Thus, the university course is, in every sense, a connecting link between the educational and the business-life. It is so, first, through its special practical schools, which directly prepare for the professions and pursuits of life; and, second, by preparing for the profession of letters, or, more properly, the profession of *thinking and teaching*, which is itself a connecting link between the spiritual and the business world.

We have thus far investigated the relation of the *educational* to the *active life*, from the *objective* point of view; but their subjective relation—their mutual relation as a means of the highest individual culture—is not less remarkable. The field of educational life is essentially the *abstract*

world—the world of *thought* and *idea;* while the field of active life is the *actual* world—the world of *action.* Thus, the one cultivates primarily the pure *intellect,* the other primarily the *will; truth* is the object of the one, *influence* the object of the other. It is the intellect which discovers truth: it is the power of the *will* which controls men. Thus, the educational and the active life are, in this respect, the complements of each other, and only by their union produce the most perfect culture of our whole nature, and the highest usefulness to our fellow-men. The man of mere thought, without power of will, can not maintain, in the actual world, the position to which his intellect entitles him; the man of strong will, without thought, only leads the community astray. Yet, not only in cultivating the *will* is active life important, but also as cultivating the pure intellect. The faculties and powers of our nature are so indissolubly connected together, that they are all best cultivated in connection. It is only by connecting the intellect with the moral nature, that the highest intellectual culture is attainable. As a motive for exertion, we must exchange the principle of *self-culture* for the principle of *duty to others.* The highest culture, like happiness, can only be attained by going out of *self* for a motive of exertion and an end of life. We have said elsewhere that this external motive must be *love of truth.* This is strictly true for the pure educational life; but if we take the whole human life, both educational and active, as a school of human culture, then we must add another, also, viz: *the good of our fellow-men.* Thus, the motive in culture, as in religion, becomes two-fold. As in religion, the motive of exertion is not primarily our own happiness, but love to God and our fellow-men, so in culture, the motive must not be self-culture, but the attainment of the True and the Good. Solomon, because he prayed not for happiness, nor riches, nor power, nor even wisdom only, but *wisdom "to judge the people,"* received not only wisdom, but also riches and power and happiness: So, also, we, if

we desire first, and strive earnestly after, not self-culture, nor even truth alone, but *truth for the sake of good* to others, shall receive not only the answer to our prayers, and the reward of our strivings, but the highest culture of which our nature is capable will be added also.

But again: there are most important complementary relations between the *general culture* of liberal education and the *special culture* of the university, showing the absolute necessity of combining them if we would attain either a *perfect culture* or a *complete philosophy*.

First, then, in the attainment of a *perfect culture*, the complementary relation of these two is very evident. General culture alone produces comprehensiveness, but, at the same time, dimness and indefiniteness of view, while special culture alone produces clearness and definiteness, certainly, but narrowness of view. The one cultivates breadth, the other profundity. General culture alone is too apt to beget, if not superficiality, at least inaccuracy, and, therefore, a want of practicalness of mind, and a want of earnestness of character; special culture alone produces, it is true, microscopic clearness and accuracy, but also, too often, microscopic narrowness of view. Like all microscopic vision, it magnifies the importance of even the most insignificant details, and thus comes narrowness of mind, bigotry of character, and uncharitableness of feeling. The student gazes through his microscope of special culture, and imagines his field of view the whole world. All that lies outside of this field is nothing to him. It is only, then, by combining general with special culture that the most perfect culture of mind and character is attained.

Equally important to the individual, and still more important to the race, and far more interesting in a philosophic point of view, is the complementary relation of a special to a general culture, in the formation of a *complete philosophy*. However much the student may cultivate himself in a general course, there necessarily comes a time when, if he

would be useful to his fellow-men—if he would add any thing to the common stock of knowledge—if he would contribute any thing to the advance of society—he must exchange the general for a special course, either in the university or in the world. The field of knowledge is now so vast, that it is utterly vain for any one man to attempt to grasp it in all its details. For the advance of knowledge, therefore, it becomes absolutely necessary that the field of knowledge, like the field of industry, should be divided and subdivided, until the human mind can exhaust what is already known in each department. The extent to which the subdivision must be carried for this purpose is almost incredible. The science of chemistry alone, already constitutes at least ten sciences, each of which is sufficient to exhaust the energies and occupy the life of any one man. Physics is subdivided to at least an equal, and organic science to a much greater, extent. In the higher departments of knowledge the subdivision is not so great; but this is only because these departments are less mature. As knowledge becomes more perfect, the same subdivision must take place in all. Science is the simplest, and, therefore, the most mature, of all branches of human knowledge, and therefore, also, most clearly exhibits in its progress the law of developement of knowledge. This law, as deduced from the study of scientific philosophy, is that of gradually increasing differentiation and specialization. This is, in fact, a fundamental law of developement of all kinds and under all circumstances.* All branches of knowledge must eventually come under it. Now, this division and subdivision of labor in the field of *thought*, like subdivision of labor in the field of *industry*, with all its immense advantages to the RACE, must be, to some extent, disastrous to the *individual*. As civilization advances, and the absolute sphere of human

* *Vide* our article on Organic Science in relation to Sociology, S. P. R., Vol. XIII., p. 44.

knowledge becomes greater, division and subdivision goes on at the same rate—the field of each man's thought becomes a smaller and smaller fragment of the whole, and increasing narrowness and incompleteness of view would seem to be the necessary result. Thus, the *collective* humanity increases constantly in *strength* and *symmetry*—in *power* to subordinate nature to his uses, and *beauty*, as an object of contemplation; but, alas! for the *individual: he* becomes more and more distorted and fragmentary—more and more a mere tool in the hands of society; *he*, to some extent, at least, offers up himself a living sacrifice on the altar of the social impulse; or, even worse, he sacrifices the health and beauty of his spiritual nature for daily bread—he sells his divine birthright for a paltry mess of pottage. Thus, while the strength and beauty of the collective humanity increases, that of the individual humanity decreases; while the collective humanity expands, the individual contracts; in proportion as society grows larger, stronger, more beautiful and complete, the tendency is that the individual grows smaller, weaker, more distorted, and fragmentary. Alas! alas! when shall the world see again such examples of completeness and strength—of symmetry of proportion combined with gigantic power—as the grand old statesmen, philosophers and artists of Greece! Is there, then, no hope for humanity? Can philosophy only gain in perfection by losing in completeness? Is the advance of society incompatible with the completeness of the individual? Is the tide of social life to be swelled only by pouring into its veins our own hearts' blood? Is society, indeed, such a huge, remorseless, devouring dragon? Not so. This is but one side of the picture. There is yet hope. Philosophy will yet vindicate her divine origin, by attaining symmetry of form as well as perfection in detail. The apparent antagonism between the individual and the collective humanity will yet be reconciled; *completely in philosophy*, and with *ever-increasing approximation* to completeness in *reality*.

Let us, then, very briefly attempt to show *how*, under the law of developement, a complete philosophy is both *objectively*, and, through education, *subjectively*, possible.

We have said that the universal law of developement is gradually increasing differentiation. This is a true, but only a partial, statement of the law. There is a *limit* to this differentiation in *philosophy*, though none in purely *material industry*. Beyond this limit, there is a reverse process of *integration* commencing and continuing. The lines of progress branch and diverge, *apparently ad infinitum*, but not so *actually*. At a certain point they begin again to converge, and approximate unity. The true expression of the law of developement, therefore, is, first, *simple unity*, or *homogeneity*, then infinite *diversity*, and finally, the coördination of this diversity into *organic unity*. We may illustrate this law in various ways, and in every department—in the developement of the earth, in the developement of the human race, in the developement of the human mind, and in the developement of knowledge, both generally and in all its departments. In the geological history of the earth we find *connecting types*, differentiated into an infinite number of distinct families, genera and species, and these all pointing to, and coördinated in, *man*. In the history of the human race, we find first a primeval simplicity and unity, then a confusion of tongues and scattering abroad, by which diversity of national character and forms of civilization was effected, and finally, even now, these diverse civilizations and nationalities are being coördinated into a general civilization, under the guidance of Christianity. In the history of the *individual*, the same law is illustrated in many ways. First, we have the simplicity, the unity, the harmony, of blind, child-like *faith* in *authority;* then comes reason, overthrowing faith and introducing doubt, discord, and anarchy—destroying the harmony, the innocence, the peace of mind; and, lastly, philosophy, or, still better, religion, solves these doubts, changes this discord into harmony and peace,

restores again faith, which is now no longer *blind*, but *rational*. The philosopher, like the Christian, must return to the simplicity of childhood. To take another illustration. First, in childhood, we have harmony, because the passions are not yet developed—peace, because the enemy is asleep; then, in youth, the fiery conflict of volcanic *passion* with *reason*, in which conflict, reason is often overthrown, and the man ruined; but at last, with the growing power of reason, these fiery enemies are subdued and subordinated into useful servants—the man stands now victor over himself—the intellect is now strong enough to assert its rule against the utmost efforts of the passions and emotions—"the whole man stands in an iron glow, white hot, perhaps, but still strong, and in no wise evaporating—melting, perhaps, but losing none of his weight."

Now, the same law is traceable in the developement of philosophy. First, we have an universal philosophy, but imperfect and temporary; then, an infinitely subdivided philosophy, more perfect in its details, but less complete in its whole—in fact, many partial philosophies, impossible to coördinate into one; lastly, as we hope, again, an universal and much more complete philosophy, formed by the coordination of these perfectly finished details. First: popular notions, opinions, intuitions (the intuitions seem peculiarly clear and true in the early periods of the history of the race, as of the individual,) are gathered and systematized by *reason* into an universal, and tolerably consistent, philosophy: then comes scientific observation, with its accurate methods, scrutinizes every fact anew and verifies every result, extends its search far beyond the limit of popular knowledge; as the field increases, dividing and subdividing into departments, determined, above all things, upon perfect accuracy and completeness of detail as the only possible foundation of a complete and permanent philosophy; from time to time coördinating the details in each department into partial philosophies, until the field of de-

tail-knowledge is well-nigh exhausted, and the circle of sciences complete: last comes the coördination of these perfect, but partial, philosophies into one universal and permanent philosophy. Man is placed in the world of sense and matter, to conquer and reduce it to rational method—to attain, by Reason, a complete knowledge of Deity, as revealed in the Book of Nature—in a word, to construct a complete philosophy. But in attempting to do so, the human mind finds itself in this strange dilemma: a perfect theory, or rational philosophy, is impossible without scientifically observed facts; and, on the other hand, it is equally impossible to make truly scientific observations without a previous theory or philosophy as a guide. How, then, does the human mind extricate itself from this dilemma? In the only way in which it is possible to do so. Upon the basis of mere *popular* observations and intuitions, it hastily constructs a *provisional* philosophy: under the guidance of this philosophy, it then proceeds to make scientific observations; and finally, upon these, more slowly and carefully, to build a permanent philosophy. This is true, not only of general philosophy, but of each subdivision of philosophy. First, we have an *hypothesis*, or provisional theory, founded upon imperfectly observed facts; under the guidance of this, scientific observation becomes possible, and is, therefore, accomplished; upon these scientifically observed facts, a true and perfect theory is formed. The one is what Bacon calls the "*anticipation* of nature;" the other, the "*interpretation* of nature;" the one is a guess—some times a happy, noble guess, indicating wonderful genius—like a gleam of light casting a vivid but *uncertain* splendor upon the surrounding darkness and chaos; the other, a sober certainty, like the steady light of full day, revealing objects in definite outline and true proportion. In the first, the proud human reason, scorning to become the patient pupil, attempts to *impose his own* philosophy upon Nature; in the second, reason is content

to sit at the feet of Nature, and humbly *accept* the philosophy which *she* teaches. Illustrations of this law, not only from the general history of philosophy, but from the history of each department, and even the subdivisions of each department, are abundant and obvious. In general philosophy, the stages are not yet all completed. The Greek philosophy, of which the Aristotelian is the type, represents the *provisional;* the permanent we are only now approximating, under the guidance of the Baconian method. In astronomy, we have the Ptolemaic system as the *provisional*, and the Copernican and Newtonian as the permanent theory. In botany, we have the Linnæan classification as the temporary, and the *Natural* classification as the permanent. In the same manner, if time allowed, we might trace the same law in the theories of chemistry, in the theories of light and heat, and even in the theories of individual natural phenomena, as of geyser eruptions, of atoll reefs, of glacier motion, etc.

The case of botany, however, is so admirable an illustration, both of the law and of its necessity, that we must dwell a little more fully. In botany, the problem presented to the human mind is, to acquire rational knowledge of the forms of the vegetable kingdom. But the number of these forms is so great, and their variety so infinite, that it is utterly impossible to commence without classification—the materials are utterly unmanageable without systematic arrangement of some sort. But a perfect classification presupposes a perfect knowledge. Under the pressure of this dilemma, we make, first, an arbitrary, or *artificial*, classification, founded upon some obvious fact. Under the guidance of this artificial classification, thousands of observers, in every part of the world, work in concert. The scientifically observed facts thus laboriously accumulated, become now a solid basis for a thoroughly natural, and, therefore, *rational*, classification. We see that in this case (and the same is true in all others) the very significance of the first

classification or *theory* is different from that of the second. The first is the necessary *condition* of rational knowledge; the second is the compendious expression and natural embodiment of rational knowledge. The first is complete, because artificial—but, for the same reason, transitory; the second never complete, because natural—but, for the same reason, also, eternal, ever growing, ever approaching completeness.

We have selected the case of botany because, on account of the great genius and authority of Linnæus, and the great beauty, and, to some extent, truth of his artificial system, this system maintained its sway until we were entirely ready for the *natural* system, which then took its place. Thus, the two stages are very distinct, and their significance obvious. In the other cases, there are, some times, many provisional theories gradually approximating and gradually merging into the permanent theory. In such cases the law is less obvious, but none the less true.

But this law, as we have already said, is not confined to the progress of knowledge, but governs progress in every direction. We will, therefore, take one other illustration, and from an entirely different quarter, viz: from the progress of social organization. Man is urged, by the social impulse, and as the only means of attaining civilization, to organize into communities; but a perfect and permanent social organization can only be the result of much experience, combined with the highest culture, moral and intellectual, and this, again, can only be attained through perfect social organization. Hence we have, first, a social organization founded upon some arbitrary and obvious principle, perhaps upon violence and injustice, or even upon accident—the human race is classified upon the obvious distinctions of birth, or wealth, or power; in a word, we have an *artificial* classification—a provisional organization, as the necessary condition of civilization. Under the fostering influence of this organization, civilization becomes

possible, and, therefore, advances. Finally, however, the classification of the human race must have a thoroughly *natural* basis—human society must be organized upon a thoroughly rational principle—must take on a thoroughly *natural* form, permanent in its outlines, though constantly improving, which is no longer only the necessary condition of progress, but also the natural expression—the material embodiment—of a perfected humanity, which is never attained. Without the first, civilization would be impossible; without the second, civilization would be arrested at a certain point. Almost all revolution is the result of the non-recognition of this law.

Perhaps the law may be placed in a still clearer point of view, by comparing the construction of a perfect philosophy, or a perfect civilization, to the construction of an edifice. Man is placed upon the earth houseless and naked. But he can not continue to live in this condition, at least in his present fallen state—he must have a house to protect him, and wherein to worship God. But how shall he, without much time, build an house worthy of himself and of God, to whom he will dedicate it? an house which shall be eternal, like God and his own soul? Under the pressure of this dilemma, he rapidly constructs a temporary edifice, sufficient for present purposes, in which he continues to live and worship while the laborers are scattered abroad, slowly gathering materials for a more glorious and permanent edifice. Now, philosophy is, at present, in this second, or transition state, though approximating the third. The laborers are scattered abroad over the whole face of the earth, gathering materials, or finishing details. Under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, some are laying the foundation, or building the solid walls; some are shaping a column, or constructing an arch; some are finishing a capital, or carving delicate tracery; some chosen ones, with washed hands, shoes removed, and pure hearts, are silently engaged upon the holiest of holies, the

innermost sanctuary, and the altar-piece. But, does any one understand the great work upon which all are engaged? Has any one a clear and perfect conception of the magnificence of the structure? Alas, no! Perhaps, in moments of ecstatic, holy enthusiasm—in moments of Divine inspiration—some noble soul may catch faint glimpses of the glorious edifice: in dim, shadowy outline, as in a vision, he may see it all standing before him in the majesty and beauty of its noble proportions—its solid walls, its glorious columns, its towering spires, stretching upward and passing out of sight, in their way heavenward—and even hear the solemn music of its deep-toned bell calling the nations to worship: in broken accents, and almost unintelligible words, he may strive, in such moments, to tell of his holy vision; but no consistent, clear and permanent conception of the whole is possible to the human mind. God alone is the Master Builder; under His direction we work, if we are indeed true workers. Some imperfect, general conception, there must be in the minds of the chief workers, for man is a co-worker with God; but He alone can fitly frame all these parts into one perfect whole. Thus, in comparing Greek philosophy with modern, we may say that the temple of their philosophy and civilization was lower in type, but more complete; ours higher in type, but still lying scattered in fragments; they lived and worshipped in a *temple* which they *enjoyed*, looking for no better; we live in shanties and *work-houses*, looking forward, in *hope* of a more glorious edifice—theirs was a purely earthly house, contrived entirely by human minds, and, therefore, clearly seen and understood, as being present to the *sense;* ours, contrived by the Divine Spirit, connects earth with heaven; while we, the workers, absorbed in petty details, can only partly apprehend it, through *faith.* We see, then, why it is that the earlier philosophers were, in many respects, viz: in completeness, symmetrical proportions, and comprehensiveness, superior to the workers of the present day. We are

apt, in comparing ancient with modern times, in respect to extent and diffusion of knowledge, to take much complacency and gratulation to ourselves; we are apt to speak of that period, compared with our own, as a *night.* Yes, it it was a night; but a night whose firmament was glorious with brilliant stars. The day has dawned, the stars are fled, but, alas! the sun has not yet risen.

Thus have we attempted to show that philosophy passes from simplicity, through complexity, again to simplicity—from unity, through infinite diversity, again to unity. Thus philosophy, like religion, must return again to its pristine simplicity and unity—but a simplicity and unity of a far higher order. The first is the simplicity of childhood; the second, the simplicity of wisdom. As might have been expected, the different departments of knowledge, in their present condition, perfectly represent these different stages of developement. The simpler departments of science, as mechanical philosophy and astronomy, have already, in great measure, passed through the first two, and reached the third; hence their simplicity, their completeness, their certainty, their definiteness of outline, and permanence of form, and the ease with which they may be grasped in their totality. In chemistry and organic science, the subdivision is, just now, greatest, because these have fairly reached the second, and only now, as we believe, commencing to approach the third. Metaphysical philosophy, psychology, and sociology, are yet in the first stage, though approaching the second. The want of subdivision in these departments is the result of *immaturity*—their unity is the unity of childhood. But their unity is not complete. They have reached the stage of *diversity of opinion*, though not of *division of labor*. It is childhood, but childhood expanding into youth—they are yet in the first stage, but painfully struggling towards the second; for *doubt* always precedes *scientific inquiry*, and the use of right method—*diversity of opinion* always precedes *division of labor* and productive work in

the field of thought. But, while different departments represent different stages, yet philosophy, as a whole, may be said to be now in the second stage, though approaching the third. The difficulty of acquiring a general philosophy has already, probably, reached its acmé, and will, from this time, become less. This law of differentiation and integration, which may be so clearly traced in the lower departments of science, is the law of developement of all philosophy. Philosophy must henceforward become simpler, and easier to grasp.

Looking, then, upon philosophy *objectively*, as the gradual developement of the divine idea in the human reason, we see how special philosophies are related to a complete general philosophy; we see that the law of developement may be expressed as a progress, from an imperfect, (and, therefore, *provisional*,) general philosophy, through *special* philosophies, to a perfect and *permanent* general philosophy. Now, this law of developement of general philosophy is epitomized, as we have already seen, in the developement of the individual, and, therefore, must be, also, *in a rational course of education.* As, in the one case, we have popular intuitions, systematized by reason into an imperfect general philosophy, then scientific observations and partial philosophies, coördinated into a more perfect general philosophy; so, in the other, we have, first, perceptions and intuitions of childhood, systematized by cultivation of reason into an *imperfect* general culture; then special courses, laying the foundation of a *more perfect* general culture. As, in the one case, we have *imperfect* general philosophy, founded upon intuitions, passing through special philosophies into a *more perfect* general philosophy, so, in the other, we have imperfect general culture, founded upon the perceptive and intuitive faculties, passing through special culture into a perfect general culture. It is *only through special culture, after a previous general culture*, that the highest general culture is attainable—it is only through a

special philosophy, or study in a *special department*, coming after a previous general study in all departments, that the most perfect general philosophy is attainable by the individual.

But how, it may be asked, can a special philosophy contribute to a general philosophy, or a special culture to a general culture, *in the individual?* The collective humanity, or race, cultivates *many* special philosophies, which are finally coördinated into a general philosophy; but the *individual* can not cultivate perfectly but *one* special department. How can the perfect knowledge of this *one* department lead to a more perfect general philosophy, in which *all* departments are embraced? The case of the individual is evidently somewhat different from that of the race—that of philosophy *objectively* considered, from that of philosophy *subjectively* considered. The answer to this question is found in the *absolute unity* of philosophy, and this, again, in the absolute unity of nature, and this, of course, in the unity of Deity. The general idea of philosophy is epitomized, with modifying conditions, in the philosophy of each department. Thus, every special philosophy contains some thing which is general and some thing which is special. It may be difficult, and often impossible, in the present state of philosophy, to distinguish these two with precision, in consciousness; but they are both necessarily involved in the idea of organic unity. If we have once grasped the general, though but imperfectly, by general culture, we may then study more perfectly *the general through the special*—this comprehension of general through the special becoming more and more possible, in proportion as philosophy approaches organic unity. If we study the general alone, our philosophy will be dim, shadowy, inaccurate in detail, incomplete, and, therefore, unproductive, *through indefiniteness:* if we study the special alone, we mistake the modifying conditions for the general law—we erect our special philosophy into a general philosophy—and our philosophy

is, therefore, incomplete, *through narrowness.* But the profound study of *one* department, after general instruction in *all*, not only gives us a perfect philosophy in that department, but, through the unity of philosophy, gives us, also, clearer insight into general philosophy—not only illumines the area of the chosen department with intense brilliancy, but sends its beams in every direction, even to the extremest verge of the circle of human knowledge. To recur again to the illustration of the building. The unity of the noble structure is so complete, that the general idea of the whole is repeated in every, even the minutest, part. Every column, every pinnacle, every arch, every door and window, every leaf or flower in the most delicate tracery, all, all tell the same tale, each in its own way—all point in the same direction—upward. Thus, after we have taken a rapid survey of all knowledge, and attained a general, though imperfect, conception of philosophy—if inspired by this general conception, we now, in honesty of purpose and humility of spirit, concentrate our energies upon a special department, this general conception will grow steadily brighter and clearer. Thus, if, standing at a distance, with becoming reverence and holy fear, we gaze and worship, until the Divine Idea of the noble structure has penetrated our minds and fired our souls—we now approach, not only as *worshippers*, but also as *workers;* not only rapturously to *gaze*, but also manfully to *do*—then the Spirit of the Master will enter and dwell within our hearts, and He, the great Master Builder Himself, will kindly reveal to us so much of His plan as we, in our weakness, are able to understand.

ARTICLE II.

THE TRINITY OF THE GODHEAD THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

V.—The three divine persons in the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—proved not to be three Gods, and, therefore, one God.

We are now led, as a fifth link in our chain of argument in proof of the Scriptural character of the doctrine of the Trinity, to conclude that the existence of one infinite divine essence, or Godhead, and of three coequal persons in that Godhead, does not imply the existence of three Gods.

Though these three divine persons are distinguished from each other by proper and personal characteristics, attributes, offices, and works, yet all that is essential to the nature of the Godhead is common to them all, so that the Son is not a different God from the Father, nor the Spirit a different God from the Father and the Son. They are not three separate Gods. The Godhead—that which constitutes each person God—is one and the same. They are all three but one, and all three necessary to the full conception of the one God. The Godhead, or essence, is not multiplied so as to make three Godheads. The Word was God, but not another God. The Holy Ghost is not man, but God, and yet not another God. Neither is there a divine nature, essence, or Godhead, which is distinct and different from that common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. There is no other divine nature but that which is common to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by virtue of which they are each "God over all, and blessed for ever."

Neither are we to imagine that this Godhead first existed, and that then a trinity of persons was formed out of it, but we are to conceive the existence of three modes, or per-

sons—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—in one common Godhead, as being essential to the very nature of that Godhead, and as being as necessary as its existence. The whole divine nature is in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost constitute that nature. They are not different either in nature, attributes or perfections. But yet they are not the same in their mode of personal subsistence, or in their relations to each other, or in their relations and functions towards creatures, in the various dispensations of providence and grace. These persons in the Godhead, therefore, can neither be divided nor destroyed. They are one in nature. They are equal in power, attributes, and glory. They are different and distinct in mode of subsistence, in person, relation, and offices. Every one of these three persons has—not a *part*—but the *whole* Godhead in himself, so that each is "the living," and "the only living and true God." And yet, in this one Godhead each person is in such a way distinct, as to be capable of distinct relations, offices, and worship. Another observation, important to be borne in mind, is, that while in worshipping the Son, we "honor Him even as we honor the Father," and while in worshipping and seeking the grace of the Spirit, we honor Him even as we honor the Son, and while we must, in every case, approach God only in the way of His own appointment, yet, when we do so, our worship of the Spirit and of the Son is equally the worship of the Father, and equally acceptable to Him, since in honoring one person in the Trinity we honor all. And hence, in baptism, we are devoted, not to the one undivided essence and Godhead of the Deity—not to the Father, merely—but to each of the distinct persons of the Godhead separately and severally, because this is the way in which God in Christ has manifested Himself to us—the way in which He works out redemption for us—and the way in which that redemption is to be sought and obtained from Him.

The Christian system can be stated, explained, supported, defended, and made practically efficacious, in no other way. The whole economy of man's salvation is based upon the fact, that while there is but one Godhead, there is in this Godhead a three-fold distinction, not in name or character, but a real, personal distinction. To each of these persons is attributed distinct offices in the work of redemption—in its origination, its completion, its application, and its consummation—while, at the same time, to each is ascribed all and every thing that is attributed to this one Godhead. Each person is thus declared to possess the common Godhead. There are, therefore, three persons in one Godhead.

The same Divine Works—Creation, Resurrection—attributed absolutely to Each Person, and to God alone.

This will appear, further, from the fact that, while each person has His peculiar relations and offices assigned to Him, yet, as if it was *designed* to prove that there are three distinct persons, and yet only one Godhead, we find that the same divine power and operation is attributed, equally and undividedly, to each of these persons, as God, and THE God by whom they are possessed and accomplished.

As this is a very essential point, we will illustrate it by two instances—which have been already presented, to prove the personal diversity of the Father, Son, and Spirit—that we may now prove by them the unity of their Godhead.

The first illustration is the work of creation.

It is the express and uniform teaching of Scripture, that God "is the maker of all things, by HIMSELF ALONE." *

Here, then, God claims that work of creation which is the most essential, and in itself the absolute demonstration of an almighty, infinite and personal God, as His work, and as *exclusively* His, and *His alone.*

---

* Acts 14 : 15 ; Gen. 1 : 1 ; Is. 44 : 24 ; Ps. 33 : 6. See the Jewish Commentators in Gill, Allix, Jameson. John 1 : 1–3.

And yet God, in His own Word, and in words inspired by Himself, represents each of the "three persons as all connected with, and coöperating in, creation. With the honors of a work usually ascribed to the Father, Paul crowns the Son. Mark what he says of the Son: 'By *Him* were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, whether they be thrones or diminions, or principalities, or powers.' And, speaking elsewhere of God, he says: 'He, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake to our fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds.' Now, as to the third person, or Holy Spirit, we discover indications of His existence even in the Mosaic record of creation. He appears in the earliest epochs of time, and amid those sublime and magnificent spectacles with which the Bible opens."

"The curtain rises upon the first act of creating power, and, through the enveloping shroud of darkness, we see the earth—a shapeless mass, crude and chaotic. It is a world in embryo. 'The earth was without form and void.' Yet at this early period, when there was neither golden cloud nor blue sky, nor green land, nor silver sea; when no waves broke upon the shore, and there were no shores for waves to break on; when no mountains rose to greet the morning sun, and there was no sun to shine on them; when no wing of bird was cleaving the silent air, nor fin of fish the waters; when—like the rude and various materials from which an architect intends to rear the fabric he has designed—the elements of fire, air, earth, and water, lay mingled in strange confusion, through the darkness that lies on the face of the deep, we discover some mighty Presence. He is moving and at work. It is the Spirit of God. He presides at the birth of time. He is evoking order from confusion, forming the world in the womb of eternity, and preparing a theatre for scenes and events of surpassing grandeur. Concerning that early period of creation, Moses

has recorded this important fact: 'The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters.' In this glorious creation, therefore—in this beautiful world, and the starry skies that rose over it—we behold the mighty monuments of His presence and power. He sprung the arch of this crystal dome, and studded it over with those gems of light. Listen to the magnificent hymn of the Patriarch: 'He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing. He holdeth back the face of His throne, and spreadeth His cloud upon it; He hath compassed the waters with bounds, and divideth the sea with His power. By His *Spirit* he hath garnished the heavens.' In the temple of nature, therefore, as in that of grace, we adore a Godhead—the Three in One; and see Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the presiding and coequal authors of a first creation."

What, then, must be our inference from these several declarations of God respecting the highest exercise of God-like power? What can it be but that the three persons—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—are alike uncreated, since they were each of them the author of creation; and, secondly, that as there is and can be but one Creator, because there is but one God, these three persons are and must be one God? In the ancient language of the Church: "The Father is uncreate; the Son is uncreate; the Holy Ghost uncreate: and yet there are not three uncreated, but one uncreated." *

The same conclusion may be deduced from what Scripture declares concerning another creating work, that of the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead.

Reject the doctrine of the Trinity, and the statements of Scripture on this subject can not be reconciled. Admit it, and all is clear.

---

* See, also, Westminster Conf. of Faith, ch. iv., § 1.

In Gal. 1 : 1, it is said: "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God THE FATHER, WHO raised Him (*i. e.*, Christ) from the dead." Again: in John 11 : 19, our Lord, speaking of His resurrection, says: "Destroy this temple," (meaning his body,) "and in three days I will raise it up again." And 10 : 17: "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."

From this, it is plain that our Lord assumes to Himself the act of raising His own body from the dead, so that here the resurrection is attributed to *the Son.*

Thirdly: 1 Peter 3 : 18, we read: "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit."

Once more, then, we see that Christ is said to be *quickened*, or brought to life, by *the Holy Ghost.*

Lastly: Peter and the other Apostles, when they are brought before the Council, in Acts 5, say, at verse 30, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus."

Now, compare all these passages together. In the first place, observe we all admit that GOD raised Jesus from the dead. Next we read, that the Father raised Him up, therefore, the *Father is God.* Again we read, that Christ the Son raised Himself up; therefore, the *Son is God.* Thirdly, we find that the Holy Ghost raised Jesus from the dead; therefore, the *Holy Ghost is God.* And yet, they are not three Gods, but one God; for Peter says: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus." And how does Moses describe this God of of their fathers? "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is ONE Lord." If, now, from a candid comparison of these Scriptures, the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity must not of necessity be believed, we would ask, What, then, do these passages mean? Is it at all probable that the writers of the New Testament would use such unguarded language as this is, if they did not mean us to believe the divinity of

each of the three persons of the Trinity? Certainly not. No writer of common prudence could have done so, much less one writing by the direction of the spirit of wisdom and truth. How such a union can exist we are *unable*, and, therefore, not required, to understand. But that it *does* exist—that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are each of them a *distinct person*—each of them God, and yet but one God, we *are* required to believe—to believe it on the peril of our souls; "for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

Nor are these exceptional cases. They are only illustrations of the general tenor of Scripture. Thus we find that the work of Providence, or the preservation of all things, is ascribed equally to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. "Jehovah is the preserver of man and beast, and the eyes of all wait upon Him." In like manner, Christ "upholdeth all things by His own power." And so, also, when the Holy Spirit is withdrawn, "they die and return again to their dust," but "Thou sendest forth Thy SPIRIT, they are created, and Thou renewest the face of the earth."*

Again: spiritual and divine operations are attributed equally to the Father, to the Son, and to the Spirit. "It is the same God which worketh all in all." Christ is "all in all." "But all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit."† "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world." ‡ "Every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him," § that is, of Christ. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Believers are sanctified by God the Father.‖ Paul, in his prayer for the Thessalonians, prays that the very God of

* Neh. 9 : 16; Ps. 145 : 15; Col. 1 : 16; Heb. 1 : 3; Ps. 104 : 29, 30.

† 1 Cor. xii. : 6; Col. iii. : 11; 1 Cor. xii. : 11.

‡ 1 John v. : 4.

§ 1 John ii. : 29.

‖ Jude, ver. 1.

peace would sanctify them wholly.* But the same Apostle, ascribes this divine work to Jesus Christ, when he says: "He that sanctifieth (that is, Christ) and they who are sanctified, are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren."† And yet this divine operation is also ascribed to the Holy Ghost, by whom Christians are often declared to be sanctified."‡ We might show, further, that a commission to the work of the ministry—the judging of the world, the raising of the dead, and many other divine and omnipotent works, are ascribed in Scripture equally to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

Interchangeable use of the name of God.

As, however, the proofs of these points are given in almost every work on the Trinity, § we proceed to remark that a still further and very striking proof of the identity of all that is essential to the Godhead, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is found in the indiscriminate and interchangeable application to each of the names of God.

The term God is employed to denote the absolute Deity, in all that is comprehended in His nature, essence, and attributes, and is, therefore, synonymous with our words Deity and Godhead. Now, this term is applied to each of the three persons, in the following, among other passages: "The Lord our God," "The Word was God," "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." When used alone, therefore, the word God appears to import the absolute Deity, apart from any consideration of unity or trinity. To the English word *God* corresponds the term *Elohim* in Hebrew, and θεος (Theos) in Greek,‖ which is used by the Apostles

* 1 Thess. v. : 23.

† Heb. ii. : 11.

‡ Rom. xv. 16.

§ See the proofs given in Jones on Trinity, ch. iv., and in West's and Eadie's Concordances to the Bible.

‖ See Hävernick, in Kitto's Cyclopœdia, art. God.

always in the singular, as it is in other languages, because they want the grace and propriety of the Hebrew, and are not adapted to convey, as it does, the primitive revelation of a God whose plurality in unity is conveyed by His Hebrew titles, Elohim and others.

The Monarchy of the Godhead, and the personal relations and subordination of the Son and Spirit.

It is when thus spoken of in his absolute Godhead, simply as God, that God is declared to be invisible, unrevealed, unknown, and incomprehensible. Jehovah is the Elohim revealed, the manifested, only perfect and holy One, our Redeemer the God of Israel, the angel of the covenant, He who was to come, who is come, who is the ερχομενος, he who is yet to come.* As thus revealed and manifested, God is made known in three distinct modes of subsistence, having mutual relations to each other, and yet having one essence or Godhead common to each. This mode of subsistence constitutes the personality, and this, together with the distinct relation in which each of these stands to the others, constitutes the persons. Upon this revealed nature of the Godhead is founded the conception of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and of their relations to each other, and of all the duties of creatures towards them.

In point of authority and order, the Father is first, the Son second, and the Holy Spirit third. In point of office, the Father is supreme, the Son subordinate to the Father, and the Holy Spirit subordinate to both. The Father is the everlasting fountain of the other persons, by whom, in an eternal generation, the Son is begotten, and from whom, in eternal procession, the Spirit proceeds. In order of nature, rank, office, and prerogative, the Father is supreme,

---

* See Hävernick, Introd. to the Old Testament, p. 56, *seq.*

and the Son and Spirit ministrative, and officially subordinate.*

"This relation of the persons of the Trinity is carefully preserved in all Scripture representations of the economy of redemption. The Father appoints, the Son executes, and the Holy Ghost applies. The Father, in a more particular manner, sustains the character of the offended Deity, and asserts the honors of divine government, for which reason He is more frequently called God than the other adorable persons. The Son appears as mediator, assuming the place of men, yet invested with the rights of the Godhead; and the Holy Ghost represents both the Father and His Son Jesus Christ, supplying the absence of the latter. We need not wonder, therefore, that the name of GOD, which is common to all the persons of the most holy and glorious Trinity, should be more frequently given to the Father, who sustains the divine character in a very particular manner in the wonderful economy of redemption."

But while this is true, and while this explains, and makes even necessary, all the language which implies inferiority, subjection, obedience, and ministration, in the Son and Spirit, yet we are abundantly taught that this is a distinction only of order, office, and relation, and not of dignity, derivation, or essential perfection. For, as has been seen, this order of naming the persons is not invariably observed in Scripture.† The term Father is not always used to designate that distinction in the Godhead which we commonly describe by the term *the first person*, but, also, in some cases, as a general title of divine nature.‡ In the same manner

---

* See Horsley's Tracts, Letter XV., p. 29; Newman's Hist. of Arianism, p. 180, etc.; Bull's Def., IV., 2, § 1, and especially Bishop's Bull's Three Treatises, and Waterland's Works.

† Mat. 28 : 19; John 5 : 7; Eph. 4 : 4–6, and 2 : 18; 2 Cor. 13 : 14; Rev. 1 : 4, 5.

‡ Deut. 32 : 6; Isa. 63 : 16; 64 : 8; Mat. 5 : 16, 48; 6 : 4; 7 : 11; John 8 : 41.

the title Lord, or Jehovah, is applied often to Christ in particular, and to God as a general appellation; and that the titles Spirit, Spirit of God, and Holy Spirit, are also employed as a general designation of the entire Godhead, is admitted by all parties.

So perfect is the union between the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that, in respect of their essential glories, what is asserted of the one, is to be understood of the other. Jesus, therefore, does not only say, "I and the Father are one;" He also affirms, "He who honors the Son, honors the Father also." And again, he says: "ALL that the Father hath is mine. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also." Again, it is said, "The things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit of God." We are plainly taught by such expressions that such is the infinite union and communion of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, that they are only known and comprehensible by each other, and that all that is spoken of one may be said of each and all.

There is not, therefore, one glory of the Father, and another glory of the Son, and another glory of the Holy Ghost. The glory of the Father is the glory of the Son, and the glory of the Holy Ghost. There is but one divine glory which God will not, and can not, give to another; and as this pertains equally to each person, the Father is called "the Father of glory"—Eph. 1 : 17; the Son, "the Lord of glory"—1 Cor. 2 : 8; and the Holy Spirit, "the Spirit of glory"—1 Pet. 4 : 14. They are thus all equally glorious, and all gloriously equal in that glory which they had with each other from before the foundation of the world.

Our object only to state Revealed Facts, and not to explain Inexplicable Mysteries.

We have ventured on these remarks, not, we again repeat, with any intention of explaining or of removing the mys-

tery of the Trinity. To do so would be absurd. The mystery remains, and must ever remain, in all that relates to the divine nature or attributes. Our only design has been to state clearly all that has been revealed, and all that is expressed, in the doctrine of the Trinity. On the one hand, the Son and Spirit are represented to us as ministering to God, and therefore are personally subordinate to Him; and, on the other hand, in spite of this official relative inequality in the offices thus ascribed by Scripture to the Son and Spirit, nevertheless the Son and Spirit are represented as being partakers of the fullness of the Father, and as being equal to Him in *nature*, and in their claims upon our faith and obedience, as is sufficiently proved by the form of baptism and the forms of doxology and benediction.

The fact that God is one, and yet that the Father, Son, and Spirit, while each partaking of this one essence, are capable of subsisting in such a manner, and of holding such relations to each other and to us, as to devise, execute, and carry on the scheme of man's redemption, is, therefore, essential to the truth of the Christian system, and to all that is vital to the hopes and happiness of man—to his proper and acceptable worship of the true God—to his reconciliation to Him, confidence towards Him, obedience to His will, conformity to His image, and to a fit preparation for the enjoyment of Him in a blessed immortality.

Of these facts we may be satisfactorily and experimentally convinced, without pretending to assign a reason for, or so much as being able to conceive, the nature of these distinctions in the Godhead, or of the manner of their operations. All attempts to explain what is inexplicable, and to render intelligible what is infinitely above and beyond the reach of our intelligence, only darken counsel by words without knowledge, create differences among those who hold the truth as it is in Scripture, and give occasion to the enemy to blaspheme.

How, then, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost subsist in the one divine nature we can not tell, and may willingly remain ignorant, since God has not thought it best, if it were even possible, to discover it to us. The Scriptures no where tell us, either in what manner the Son is begotten of the Father, or in what manner the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and Son. And how, then, can we pretend to say how these three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, subsist in one? Surely, it does not become us to determine the way and manner of God's subsistence, when He in His Word is silent concerning it. It may, and it should, be enough for us, that the facts of God's unity in a trinity of persons, of the relations in which we stand to these persons, and our duties and hopes founded upon them, are clearly revealed.

Summary, and Conclusion of the Argument.

Believing, then, that in nature—that is, in all that is essential to Him as God—God is and can be only and absolutely one, so that there can not possibly be more Gods than one; believing that, according to the uniform and constant language of Scripture, there are, and must be, distinctions in this divine unity; believing that these distinctions are real and personal, and not nominal nor figurative; believing that each of these persons is, by every form of expression that could convey the fact, most certainly declared by God to be God, and to possess and to do all God possesses and does, and to be equal with God in power, in glory, in worship and works; and believing, nevertheless, these three persons are one God over all, and blessed for ever; believing, we say, these things, is to believe only THE FACTS which are presented to our faith by God himself in His own Word, which was given by inspiration through holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and which Word was given for the very purpose of revealing God to us, His own nature, and will, and

mercy, so far as was necessary for our present duty and consolation.

Without this revelation we are in the condition of ancient philosophers, as described by Lucretius:

> "Stretching unfathomably at boundless thought,
> Intensest visions were before him brought,
> Unreal shadows; yet his spirit stern
> Did still unconscious for that Presence yearn
> Which clothes itself with circumambient day,
> Swifter than solar beams or lightning ray.
> Grasping infinity, he nothing found,
> Then from the vacuum shrunk that yawn'd around;
> Spread like the blind his hands, therein to clasp
> Annihilation in his feeble grasp;
> As if some fiend that mock'd him in its place
> Left but a shadow in his void embrace.
> And thus he fail'd that mystery to scan,
> The greatness and the littleness of man."

To the law and testimony, therefore, be our appeal, and to it let us render "the obedience of faith." Reason requires us to come to it with implicit deference, knowing that it must contain things too high for us, things else unimaginable and always mysterious, and that it must be heard in reverent docility and teachableness, not according to any private interpretation, but in the plain teaching of the Holy Ghost.

And as the question before us is the doctrine of Scripture, no forced construction can give us that doctrine. And hence the unavoidable tendency of the Unitarian views to destroy the authority and inspiration of Scripture, is palpable proof that its witness, which is true, is destructive of that system; while the presumptive argument leading us to anticipate in Scripture the doctrine of the Trinity, is in itself a proof, that in teaching, as it does, the doctrine of the Trinity, it is what it claims to be, the Word and the Wisdom of God.

What saith the Scriptures is, therefore, the only rational controversy. For if the premises are taught in Scripture, then to reject the conclusions is to be wiser than God. It is to call God a liar. It is to affirm and to deny when ignorance is complete, and the subject is infinite, and the speaker is divine. It is to say a trinity of persons contradicts a unity of essence in the ever-blessed God, when both the nature of the essence and the nature of the personality are infinitely incomprehensible.

Yea, the heathen themselves will rise up in judgment against such presumption, and condemn it, seeing that Plato and others were led to regard the doctrine of a Trinity as agreeable to, and in no way contrary to, reason, and never suspected that it was liable to the charge of nonsense, contradiction and absurdity, and seeing that this was reserved for such atheists and sceptics as Porphyry, and Lucian, and Celsus, and Plotinus, and Proclus.*

---

* "In the opinions of the Pagan Platonists we have, in some degree, an experimental proof that this abstruse doctrine can not be the absurdity which it seems to those who misunderstand it. Would Plato, would Porphyry, would even Plotinus, have believed the miracles of Mahomet, or the doctrine of transubstantiation? But they all believed a doctrine which so far, at least, resembles the Nicene, as to be loaded with the same or greater objections."

After showing that Plato's doctrine was referred by the Fathers to his knowledge of Moses, Stillingfleet remarks: "They never suspected it to be liable to the charge of nonsense and contradictions, as our modern Unitarians charge the Trinity with; although their notion, as represented by Porphyry, be as liable to it. How came these men of wit and sense to hit upon, and be so fond of, such absurd principles, which lead to the belief of mysterious nonsense and impossibilities, if these men may be trusted?" "That this hypostasis did maintain its reputation long in the world. For we find it continued to the time of Macrobius, who mentions it as a reasonable notion, viz: of one Supreme Being, Father of all, and a mind proceeding from it, and soul from mind. Some have thought that the Platonists made two created beings to be two of the divine hypostases; but this is contrary to what Plotinus and Porphyry affirm concerning it, and it is hard

Without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness. Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out.

Testimony of the Primitive Church to the Monarchy in the Trinity.

The views of some of the earliest Fathers will appropriately close and complete this article.

The following quotation from Dionysius Romanus (A. D. 260) defines the catholic doctrine of the Trinity with as much precision as Athanasius himself could have used:

"It would be right," says Dionysius, "for me to address myself next to those who divide and separate and destroy the holiest doctrine of the Church of God—the Unity—into three essences and divided existences, and three Godheads. For I hear that there are some among your teachers and preachers of the Word, who countenance this notion; who are opposed, as I may say, diametrically, to the opinion of Sabellius. For the blasphemy of the latter consists in saying, that the Son is Himself the Father, and *vice versa;* but these others preach in a manner THREE GODS, dividing the holy Unity into three existences, foreign from each other, and altogether separate: whereas, the divine Word must be united with the God of the universe; and the Holy Ghost must reciprocally pass into, and dwell in, God; in short, the divine Trinity must be summed up and brought together into one, as a head, I mean the almighty God of the universe." After condemning the heresy of Marcion, and the notion of Christ being a creature, he continues: "We must, therefore, neither divide the wonderful and divine Unity into three Godheads; nor destroy the dignity

---

to give an account how they should, then, be essentially different from creatures, and be hypostases in the divine essence." See Stillingfleet on the Trinity, pp. 214, 217; Horsley's Tracts, pp. 75, 82.

and exceeding greatness of the Lord, by making him a creature; but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his Son, and in the Holy Ghost; and that the Word is united with the God of the universe: for 'I,' says he, 'and the Father are one,' (John x. : 30,) and 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me,' (xiv. : 10,)—for thus both the divine Trinity, and the holy doctrine of the Unity, will be preserved."*

Tertullian (A. D. 200) says of Praxeas: "He thinks that we can not believe in one God in any other way, than if we say that the very same person is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; as if *one* might not be *all*, (if *all* proceed from *one*,) by unity of substance, and still the mystery of the divine economy be preserved, which divides the Unity into a Trinity, pointing out three, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost: but three, not in condition, but in order; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in species; but of one substance, and of one condition, and of one power. These persons assume the number and arrangement of the Trinity to be a division of the Unity; whereas, the Unity, which derives a Trinity from itself, is not destroyed by it, but has its different offices performed. They, therefore, boast, that two and three Gods are preached by us, but that they themselves are worshippers of one God; as if the unity, when improperly contracted, did not create heresy; and a trinity, when properly considered, did not constitute truth." †

Again, he says: "Thus, the union of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Comforter, makes three beings united one to the other; which three are one thing (*unum*), not one person (*unus*); as it is written, 'I and the Father

---

* Decret. Syn. Nic., c. 26, p. 231, *et apud.* Routh Relig. Sacr., Vol. III., p. 179. Burton's Test. of Fathers, pp. 128, 129.

† Burton's Test. of Fathers, p. 68.

are one,' (John x. : 30,) with respect to the unity of substance, not to numerical individuality."*

"It is impossible," Origen says, "to compare God the Father, in the generation of his only begotten Son, and in his mode of existence, to any man or other animal who begets; but there must necessarily be some thing special, and suited to God, for which no comparison of any kind can be found, not only in existing things, but not even in thought and idea, so as for human thought to comprehend how the unbegotten God is made the Father of an only begotten Son. For the generation is eternal and everlasting, in the same manner as effulgence is generated from light. For he does not become a Son from without, by spiritual adoption, but is a Son by nature." Origen proceeds to confirm this by passages of Scripture, such as Heb. i. : 3; but he dwells particularly on Col. i. : 15, where the Son is called "the image of the invisible God." He considers in what sense the term *image* can be applied to the Son of God; and having observed that every son may be called the image of the father who begat him, he says, that in this sense the Son of God may be *the image of God;* "which image contains the unity of nature and substance, of Father and Son."†

Irenæus (A. D. 185) says: "And thus there is shown to be one God the Father 'who is above all, and through all, and in all things.' The Father is *above all things*, and He is the head of Christ; the Word is *through all things*, and He is the head of the Church; the Spirit is *in all of us*, and He is the living water which the Lord supplies to those who believe rightly in Him, and love Him, and know that *there is one Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.*" Again, he says: "That the Word, that is, the Son, was always with the Father, I have proved at much

* Burton's Test. of Fathers, p. 80.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 88, 89.

length; but that Wisdom, also, which is the Spirit, was with Him before all creation, he says in the words of Solomon (Prov. iii. : 19, 20; viii. : 22–27.)*

Clemens Alexandrinus, (A. D. 194,) says: "Nothing, therefore, is hated by God, nor yet by the Word, for both are one, God; for He says: 'In the beginning the Word was in God, and the Word was God.'" This same idea, of *both being one*, is found still more strongly expressed at the end of this treatise, where Clemens addresses a prayer to the Logos, and begins it with these words, which it is difficult to translate: "Be merciful, Instructor, to Thy children, O Father, the Director of Israel, Son and Father, both one, Lord."† Again: Clemens asks leave to "offer praise and thanksgiving to the only One, to the Father and Son, Son and Father, to the Son, who is Instructor and Teacher, together with the Holy Ghost, in all things one, in whom are all things, through whom all things are one, through whom is eternity." There may be parts of this sentence which are difficult to be comprehended; but it is unquestionable, that the Son and Holy Ghost are united with the Father as objects of praise, and the Greek words can hardly admit any other construction than that which declares the three persons to be one.‡

---

* Burton's Test. of Fathers, pp. 49, 50.

† *Ibid.*, p. 56.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

ARTICLE III.

GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.

The subject to which we invoke our readers' attention has been much debated. But our purpose is not to weary them with a repetition of those discussions concerning a Pre-Adamite earth, the length of the creative days, or the best way to reconcile geology with Moses, which have often been conducted within a few years past; with deficient knowledge and temper in some cases, and often with slight utility. In the progress of natural science, relations between it and theology become apparent from time to time; and frequently in very unexpected ways. Both parties are usually at fault in defining those relations in the beginning; and thus there occurs a season of somewhat confused contest, arising from the oversight of the proper "metes and bounds" of the two sciences. As the discussion proceeds, the facts are at length set forth, which enable all reasonable men to adjust the relations satisfactorily, and to appropriate to each its legitimate field of authority. All will agree that it is time such an adjustment were, if possible, begun, between the geologist and the divine. Our humble attempt will be to make such a beginning. We have no geologic theory to advance or to impugn, and no particular facts to advance, either new or old. But, looking back over the general course of the discussion on the structure of our globe, only as those may profess to do who keep up with general literature, without assuming to be professional geologists, we would endeavor to fix some principles of discussion, by which the application of natural science and its inferences, may be defined, and limited to their proper territory, and the claims of theology established along the points of contact. It would, perhaps, have been better for the divines if they had confined their efforts to these defen-

sive views, instead of entering, without being always adequately prepared, into the technical discussions of geology.

1. But, while making this admission at the outset, we would firmly protest against the arrogant and offensive spirit in which geologists have often, we may almost say, usually, met clerical criticisms of their reasonings. To the objections advanced by theologians, the answer has usually been a contemptuous assertion that they were incompetent to sit in judgment, or to object, when geology was in question, because they were not professional masters of the science. Their reasonings have been pronounced foolish, ignorant, mistaken: and slightingly dismissed or rejected without fair examination, because they came from "parsons." Now, we freely grant, that it is a very naughty thing for a parson, *or a geologist*, to profess to know what he does not know, as well as a very foolish: that some of the "*genus irritabile vatum*" have doubtless been betrayed into this folly by their zeal against infidel science (as they supposed it), and that geologists have not been at all behind them (as some instances will show before we have done), in the mortifying displays of ignorance and sophistry they have made, in their attempts to use the weapons of the theologian and expositor. But, we would remark, while the specialities on which inductions are founded, in any particular branch of natural science, are, of course, better known to the professor of the speciality, the man of general intelligence may judge the deductions made from the general facts just as well as the other. Any inductive logic is the same in principle with all other inductive logic, and all deductive logic also is similar. Yea, conclusions from facts may some times be drawn more correctly by the man of general science than by the plodding collector of them; because the former applies to them the appropriate logic with a more correct and expansive view, and, perhaps, with less of the prejudice of hypothesis. The man who defined the inductive logic was not a naturalist by special

profession—was not practically skilled in any one department of natural history—but was a great philosopher and logician.

If, then, after geologists have described and generalized their facts, and have explained their conclusions therefrom, a class so well educated as the clergy must be pronounced unfitted to form an opinion upon them, the fault must be in the geologist or his science. If demonstration is there, it ought surely to be visible to the intelligent eye. How absurd is it for the advocates of the science to recalcitrate against the opinions of an educated class of *men*, when they virtually offer their systems to the comprehension of *boys*, by making them a subject of collegiate instruction; and one (who has, perhaps, more scornfully than any other, derided the criticisms of clerical opponents,) to popular assemblages of clerks and mechanics? Surely, if Mr. Hugh Miller thought that he could convince a crowd of London mechanics intelligently, in one night's lecture, of his theory of the seven geologic ages, it is absurd to claim that the science is too recondite for the unholy inspection of parsons' eyes.

There must always be a peculiar reason for the meddling of theologians in this subject. It is, that it is virtually a theory of cosmogony; and cosmogony is intimately connected with the doctrine of creation, which is one of the modes by which God reveals himself to man, and one of the prime articles of every theology. The inevitable connection of the two might be inferred from this fact, that all the cosmogonies of the Ancients were natural theologies: there is no philosopher of whom we know any thing, among the Greeks and Romans, who has treated the one without treating the other. It must, therefore, be always expected that theologians will claim an interest in geologic speculations, and will require them to be conformed to sound principles of logic and exposition.

2. On the other hand, the attitude and temper of many of the eager defenders of inspiration, towards the new science, have been most unwise. By many, a jealousy and uneasiness have been displayed, which were really derogatory to the dignity of our cause. The Bible is so firmly established upon its impregnable evidences, it has passed safely through so many assaults, has witnessed the saucy advance of so many pretended demonstrations of its errors, which were afterwards covered with ridicule by the learned, that its friends can well afford to be calm, patient, and dignified. They should be neither too eager to repel and denounce, nor too ready to recede from established expositions of the text at the supposed demand of scientific discoveries. They should assume the calm assurance, which regards all true science, and every genuine discovery, as destined inevitably to become the handmaids, instead of the assailants, of revelation. Especially to be deprecated is that shallow and fickle policy, which has been so often seen among the professed defenders of the Bible, in hastily adopting some newly coined exposition of its words, made to suit some supposed exigency of new scientific discovery, and as hastily abandoning it for some still newer meaning. They have not even waited to ascertain whether the supposed necessity for relinquishing the old exposition has been really created by a well-established discovery; but, as prurient and shallow in science as in theology, they have adopted on half evidence some new-fangled hypothesis of scientific facts, and then invented, on grounds equally insecure, some new-fangled explanations to twist God's Word into seeming agreement with the hypothesis. It would be well for us to ascertain whether our position is really stormed, before we retreat to search for another. But, several times within a generation, the world has seen a certain class of theologians saying, that the old popular understanding of the Bible upon a given subject must be relinquished; that science had proved it untenable, but that

they had at last found the true and undoubted one. And this they proceeded to sustain with marvellous ingenuity and zeal. But, after a few years, the natural philosophers relinquish, of their own accord, the hypothesis which had put these expositors to so much trouble, and introduce with great confidence a different one. And now, the divines tell us, they were mistaken a second time as to what the Bible intended to teach about it: but they are certain they have it right at last. So a third exposition is advanced. It has been this short-sighted folly, more than any real collision between the Bible and science, which has caused thinking men to doubt the authority of inspiration, and to despise its professed expounders. If they are to be believed, then the Word of God is but a sort of clay, which may be moulded into any shape required by the purposes of priest-craft. Clergymen ought to know enough of the history of human knowledge to be aware that true science advances slowly and cautiously, that great and revolutionizing discoveries in physical laws are not established every day; that a multitude of hypotheses have been mistaken, before our times, for demonstrations, and afterwards relinquished; and that even true inductions are always, to a certain extent, tentative, and require to be partially corrected after the science has been pushed to farther advances, from which fuller light is reflected back upon them. It will be time enough, therefore, for us, as professional expositors of the Mosaic history, to settle and proclaim a plan for expounding it in harmony with geology, when geology has settled itself. Our wisdom would be to commit the credit and authority of God's Word to no theory except such as is absolutely established by the laws of sound exegesis; and when we have thus taken a well considered position, to maintain it firmly against all mere appearances.

3. It should, in the third place, be clearly decided what is the degree of authority which we are to claim for the Bible upon those questions of physics which lie along the

path of its topics. Many claim for geology a license here, which comes very near to the deceitful distinction of the Schoolmen, between the philosophical and theological truth. When their daring speculations clearly contravened the teachings of Scripture, they said that these opinions were true in philosophy, though false in theology. In a somewhat similar spirit, it is now pleaded for geology, that it has its domain in a different field of investigation and evidence from that of the Bible. Each kind of evidence is valid in its own sphere, it is said; and, therefore, the teachings of each science are to be held true, independently of each other. But all truths are harmonious *inter se.* If one proposition contradicts another, no matter from what field of human knowledge it may be brought, manifestly, both can not be true. If, then, the Bible, properly understood, affirms what geology denies, the difference is irreconcilable; it can not be evaded by any easy expedient like that described above; it can only be composed by the overthrow of the authority of one or the other of the parties.

To determine how the Bible should be understood in its allusions to physical facts, we must bear in mind the object of God in giving it. His purpose was not to teach us philosophical knowledge, but theological. Nothing seems plainer than that God acts on the scheme of leaving men to find out, by their own researches, all those facts and laws of nature, the knowledge of which may minister to curiosity or to material well-being; while He limits Himself to giving us those divine facts and laws which man's research could not discover, or could not adequately establish, necessary for our attaining our proper theological end. Philosophy is our teacher for the body and for time; revelation, for the soul and for eternity. When revelation says any thing concerning material nature, it is only what is made necessary to the comprehension of some theological fact or doctrine. And in its observance of this distinction the Bible is eminently a practical book, saying nothing

whatever for mere curiosity, and stopping at just what is essential to religious truth. Hence, we ought to understand that when the Scriptures use popular language to describe physical occurrences or facts, all they mean is, to state the apparent phenomena, as they would seem to the popular eye to occur. They never intended to give us the non-apparent, scientific mechanism of those facts or occurrences; for this is not essential to their practical object, and is left to the philosopher. Hence, when natural science comes, and teaches us that the true *rationale* of apparent phenomena is different from that which seems to be suggested by the terms of the Scripture, and of popular language, there is no real contradiction between science and the Bible, or between science and the popular phraseology. For instance, the exposition of such passages, which led the doctors of Salamanca to condemn Columbus' geography as unscriptural, and the Inquisition and Turretin to argue against the astronomy of Galileo, as infidel, was mistaken. The former argued against Columbus, that the Psalms speak of the heavens as spread out like a canopy, and the earth as immovable and extended. Turretin argues most methodically that the Copernican scheme of the heavens can not be true, because the Scriptures speak of the earth as "established that it can not be moved;" of the sun as "going forth to his circuit in the heavens;" and of sun and moon as "setting," "rising," "standing still" at Joshua's command. We now clearly see that all this was an exegetical folly. And, now that we know it is the earth that moves, and not the sun, we no more dream of charging the Bible with error of language, than we do the astronomer himself, when he says, perhaps on the very pages of his almanac, "sun rises," "sun sets," "sun enters Capricorn," etc. For such really are the apparent motions of those bodies, and had the Bible departed from the established popular phraseology in mentioning them, to use terms of scientific accuracy, it would have been gratuitous

pedantry, aggravated by the fact that it would have been unintelligible and absurd to all nations which had not yet developed the Copernican astronomy.

Now, so far as the demands of modern geology upon our understanding of the Mosaic record are analagous to the concessions made above, we cheerfully yield them. It was with a view to the illustration of this new application that the familiar principle was again stated by us. And we find this principle, which we thus concede, claimed by the Christian geologists, as Hugh Miller, to cover all possible liberties which they find it convenient to take with the sacred text. This, then, is another point which requires careful adjustment. When Moses seems to say that God brought our world out of nothing into an organized state, about six thousand years ago, and in the space of six days, are his words to be classed along with those passages which denote physical occurrences according to their popular appearance, and which are to be interpreted, as we do the popular language about them, in obedience to the discoveries of natural science? Or, does this class of passages belong to a different category? We are compelled to take the latter answer as the proper affirmative. In the first place, the reference to physical facts in the record of creation is not merely subsidiary to the narrative or statement of some theological truth, but is introduced for its own sake. For, creation is not only a physical fact; it is a theological doctrine. The statement of it is fundamental to the unfolding of the whole doctrine of the creature's relation to his Creator. It is not one of those things which revelation treats as being intrinsically outside its scope, and which it, therefore, only introduces allusively. It is the first of those "things of God," which it was the proper and direct object of revelation to teach authoritatively. Second: the fact of creation had no apparent phase, different from its true scientific one, like the seeming dome of the skies, the rising sun, the stable earth; for the simple reason, that it had no

human spectators. Hence, there could be no popular mode of representation, different from the true scientific *rationale*, as there was no people to observe the apparent phenomena and describe them. But we have seen that the popular language of the Bible about the rising sun, and such like apparent phenomena, receives its explanation purely from the fact that it is conformed to the apparent and obvious occurrences, and to the established popular language founded thereon. Instead, therefore, of requiring these passages to stand waiting until they receive their proper construction from the hand of natural science, they are to be construed, like the remainder of the doctrinal teachings of the Scriptures, according to their own independent laws of exegesis, honestly applied.

Farther: when the proper rights of revelation, as related to natural science, are defined, it is most important that we assert their independence of it. Most geologists speak as though, on any subject which the researches of human science may happen to touch, the Bible must say only what their deductions permit it to say. The position to which they consign God's Word is that of a handmaid, dependent, for the validity of the construction to be put upon its words, upon their permission. Now this, we boldly assert, is intrinsic rationalism; it is the very same principle of baptized infidelity which reappears from so many different points of view, from Socinianism, Neologism, Abolitionism, exalting the conclusions of the human understanding over the sure word of prophecy. Let us fully concede that the Bible has been often misinterpreted, and thus its infallibility has been cited to sustain what God never meant it to sustain; that its correct exposition may, especially in certain parts of it, require great patience, caution, and modesty; and that it is wrong to claim its teachings as authoritative on any point, unless we have ascertained the true meaning of the text, beyond a peradventure, by the just application of its own laws of exposition. But still, the

Bible must be held to have its own ascertainable and valid laws of exposition; and its teachings, when duly ascertained, must be absolutely authoritative in all their parts, without waiting on or deferring to any conclusions of human science whatsoever: otherwise, it is practically no Bible; it is no "rule of faith" for a human soul. For, to say nothing of the uncertainties and fallibility of human reasonings, of the numerous mistakes of science once held to be demonstrated, how preposterous is the idea that our Bible held out to all the generations of men before Cuvier what professed to be an infallible cosmogony, while they had no possible means (the science which was to interpret it being undeveloped) to attain the true meaning, or to discover, by the laws of exposition of the language itself, their misunderstanding of it? Such a revelation would be a mere trap. But, worse than this; just as all our forefathers, when reading the first chapter of Genesis, supposed they were reading a plain story, which they were invited and permitted to comprehend, but were, all the while, deceived; so we may now be unconsciously accepting a number of Bible propositions as authoritative, and staking our souls upon them, which are destined to receive, several hundred years hence, a totally different interpretation—an interpretation impossible for us to attain—from the light of some science as yet undeveloped, either geological, or astronomical, or ethical, or ethnological. And who can guess in what part of the Bible these quick-sands are? All seems like solid ground to us now: but so did Genesis seem to our honest forefathers. We repeat, if they sinned against the Bible's own independent laws of exegesis, in venturing to put a sense on the first of Genesis, if there was any thing in those laws of exegesis themselves which, properly observed, would have sufficed to warn them off from their unwarranted interpretations, they were wholly to blame for their mistake. But if not, if the Bible was dependent for a fair understanding on a science as yet wholly undevel-

oped, then in those places it really means nothing in itself; and in seeming to mean some thing it is a mere trap for honest people. And so, we repeat, until human science shall have made its last advance in every circle of knowledge which can ever inosculate with theology, we must remain in suspense, whether there are not other hollow places in this Bible, which are betraying us. Obviously, such a book is not authoritative to a rational soul. And obviously, he who holds the authority of the Bible only in the sense described, is but a rationalist in spirit, whatever may be his Christian or his clerical profession. But, it may be objected: "Does not every enlightened Christian hold that it is the glory of the Bible to receive illustration from every light of human science?" We reply: It is its glory to have all human science ancillary to it, not dominant over it; to have its meaning illustrated, *but not created*, by all the discoveries of true science.

4. An equally important adjustment is to be made, as to the party which is bound to assume the burden of proof in this discussion between the Mosaic and the Geologic records. We consider that the theologian, who asserts the infallibility of the Bible, and the independency and sufficiency of its own laws of interpretation, is entitled to the preliminary presumption; and, therefore, the burden of proof rests upon the geologist, who asserts a hostile hypothesis. The authority of the Bible, as our rule of faith, is demonstrated by its own separate and independent evidences, literary, historical, moral, internal, prophetical. It is found by the geologist in possession of the field, and he must assume the aggressive, and positively dislodge it from its position. The defender of the Bible need only stand on the defensive. That is, the geologist may not content himself with saying that his hypothesis (which is opposed to Bible teachings) is plausible, that it can not be scientifically refuted, that it may adequately satisfy the requirements of all the physical phenomena to be accounted

for. All this is naught, as a successful assault on us. We are not bound to retreat until he has constructed an absolutely exclusive demonstration of his hypothesis; until he has shown, by strict scientific proofs, not only that his hypothesis *may be* the true one, but that *it alone can be* the true one; that it is impossible any other can exclude it. And we, in order to retain our position, are not at all bound to construct any physical argument to demonstrate geologically that Moses' statement of the case is the true one; for, if the Bible is true, what it teaches on this subject is proved true by the biblical evidences, in the absence of all geologic proof. Nor are we under any forensic obligation to refute the opposing hypothesis of the geologist by geologic arguments, farther than this; that we shall show geologically that his argument is not a perfect and exclusive demonstration. If we merely show, by any flaw in his conclusion, by the citation of any phenomenon irreducible to the terms of his hypothesis, that his demonstration is incomplete, we have successfully maintained the defensive: we hold the victory.

Now, have geologists always remembered this? Nay, is it not notoriously otherwise? It would seem as though this interesting young science had a sort of fatality for infecting its votaries with a forgetfulness of these logical responsibilities. Perhaps this would be found equally true of every other physical science of wide extent, of complex phenomena, and of fascinating character, while in its forming state. But every acute reader of the deductions of geologists perceives numerous instances where they quietly substitute the "may be" for the "must be," and step unconsciously from the undisputed probability of an hypothesis to its undisputed certainty. And one's observation of nature need proceed but a small way, to light upon instances in which phenomena exist which would receive a given solution just as plausibly as certain others; while the geologists imagine a reason for withholding that solu-

tion in the cases which would thus spoil their hypothesis. That they can not yet claim that exclusive and perfect demonstration of their hypothesis which is required of their position, as holding the aggressive, seems very plain from familiar facts. One is, the radical differences of hypothesis to which leading geologists are committed, up to this very day. Sir Charles Lyell makes it almost the key-note of his system, that all geologic changes were produced by such causes as are now at work, and operating, in the main, with no greater speed than they now exhibit. Hugh Miller, and others, are equally sure that those changes were produced by successive convulsions and earth-tempests, revolutionizing in a short time the state of ages. Some reconcile the "stony record" with that of Moses, upon the scheme advocated by Dr. Chalmers, which pushes back all the mighty changes to that interval ending, in Gen. 1 : 2, when "the earth was without form, and void." Others, with Miller, and Professor Tayler Lewis, adopt the very different theory of the six creative days extending to vast periods of time. Mr. Miller is certain that the fossil *flora* and *fauna* indicate just the order, in the main, as to the succession which their chief developments had in the geologic ages, which is set down in Genesis as the work of the several days. Many others, equally great, declare just the opposite.

A reasonable mistrust of the perfectness of geological demonstrations is excited, again, by instances of obvious haste and inconclusiveness in their inferences from supposed facts. Of this, one or two illustrations must suffice. Few of their writers rank higher than Sir Charles Lyell. In the London edition of his "Principles of Geology," 1850, page 205, we have an attempt to make an estimate of the age of the earth's present crust, from the character of the deep gorge, or great rocky gully, in which the Niagara river flows from the falls towards Lake Ontario. The deep part of this channel is said to be about seven miles

long. The author first satisfies himself, on grounds which might, perhaps, amount to probability, that this whole gorge may have been excavated by the torrent itself. This is the first element of the calculation. Through the rest of the argument this probability is tacitly turned into a certainty. The next element to be ascertained is, the rate at which the river now digs out its channel, and the edge of the cataract recedes. A previous intelligent inquirer concluded, upon the best testimony he could collect upon the spot, that the falls receded a yard each year; but Sir Charles assumes an average of a foot per year as the more correct rate, on grounds which he does not state. This second source of uncertainty is, also, quietly ignored. Then it is calculated that the Niagara has been flowing thirty-five thousand years. While the author does not venture to vouch for this positively, he concludes by indicating to his reader that his private opinion is, the time was more likely longer than shorter. Now, even the unscientific visitor of Niagara can not fail to observe, what Sir Charles himself correctly states, that the perpendicular face of the gorge, of the cataract, and of the lower edge of Goat Island, reveals this structure:—on the top there is a vast layer or stratum of hard grey limestone, nearly horizontal, and, at the falls, nearly ninety feet thick; while all below it, to the bottom of the precipice, is a soft shale. The real obstruction to the very rapid cutting away of the precipice by the tremendous torrent, is the solidity of the limestone layer, whose surface forms the bottom of the river above the falls. When that once gives way, the rest is speedily removed. Any person can easily understand that the permanency with which this limestone layer withstands the water depends chiefly on its thickness, and also on its dip, or inclination, and on the frequent occurrence or absence of fissures or seams, destroying the cohesion of its masses to each other. Now, will not the reader be surprised to learn that, even in the two miles which ex-

tend from the cataract down to the Suspension Bridge, this all-important stratum of limestone is diminished more than half in its thickness, the soft and yielding shale forming the remainder of the cliffs? So that, to say nothing of the high probability of the occurrence of the two other causes within the seven miles, we have here a cause for the recession of the cataract greatly more rapid than that which now obtains. Sir Charles Lyell concludes with these words: "At some points it may have receded much faster than at present, but its general progress was probably slower, because the cataract, when it began to recede, must have had nearly twice its present height." Did not the waters then have more than twice their present momentum? So that common sense would say that if there was more earth to be worn and dug away, there was far more power to do it. Surely, such reasoning as the above does not make an exclusive and perfect demonstration!

Another instance shall be taken from the same author. On page 219 he presents us with an argument for the great age of the world, from the length of time the Mississippi has been employed in forming its alluvial delta. The elements of the calculation are, of course, the area and depth of the alluvial deposite, giving the whole number of cubic yards composing it, the quantity of water passed down the stream in one year, and the per-centage of solid matter contained in the water in its average state of muddiness. The *data* upon which the depth of the alluvium is fixed are only two, the average depth of the Gulf of Mexico, and a well or shaft sunk near lake Pontchartrain. Are either of these sufficient? Is it not customary for strata to dip towards seas and oceans? If the spot at which the well was dug happened to be one of those sunk far below the usual level by earthquake agencies (and Sir Charles himself saw that such agencies had produced just such results in the region of this same river, near New Madrid), would it not come, in the course of a few hundred years, to receive far

more than the average thickness of alluvial deposite? But let us come to the other element, the per-centage of sediment in the water. From the observations of Dr. Riddell he learns that it is one three-thousandth part, in bulk, of the water. Two other observers, Messrs. Brown and Dickeson, make it one five hundred and twenty-eighth part, and they make the volume of water one-third more! Sir Charles concedes that "so great a discrepancy shows the need of a new series of experiments." Did either of the observers take pains to ascertain whether the larger part of the sediment does not gravitate towards the bottom of the water, while flowing, and to go down any part of the one hundred and sixty-eight feet, which measures the depth of the river at New Orleans, to procure the water which they examined? We are not informed. The observations on the annual volume of water were made at New Orleans. Was any allowance made for the waters which flow off in such vast quantities through the delta, by the *bayous*, and during the gigantic freshets, leaving the main channel above New Orleans? We are not informed. Again, the total volume of the water passing New Orleans in a year depends on its velocity. Now, experienced pilots and boatmen of the Mississippi are generally of opinion that the lower strata of water in its channel run with far more velocity than the surface. Hence the calculators, in gauging the surface velocity, were probably entirely at fault as to the real volume of water. Last: it is universally known that the Mississippi is nearly twice as muddy, on the average, at the head of the delta as at New Orleans! How much is this notable calculation worth after all these deductions? But, for all that, he *chooses* to assume Dr. Riddell's estimate for his basis, and thus proves (!) that the Mississippi has been running one hundred thousand years.

Now, let the reader note, that we do not advance the inconclusiveness of these two calculations as sufficient proof, by itself, that the world *is not* thirty-five thousand, or

one hundred thousand years old. But we advance it upon the principle expressed in the adage, "*Ex pede Herculem.*" The detection of such hasty and shallow reasoning gives sufficient ground of mistrust as to their general conclusions.

Another specimen shall be drawn from Hugh Miller, ludicrous enough to relieve the tedium of this discussion. In the "Testimony of the Rocks," (Boston: 1857, p. 259,) he is arguing that the fossil animals were produced by natural law, vast ages ago, because they exhibit marks of creative design similar to those we now find in the living works of nature. One of his evidences is a little coral, the "Smithia Pengellyi," which constructed its bony cells such that the fracture of them presented a surface remarkably similar to a certain calico pattern, which had proved extremely popular among the ladies. The conclusion is, that as this calico must have been very pretty—(as though the better part of creation had never been known to exhibit their sweet caprices by admiring things for their very ugliness)—the Creator undoubtedly caused these coral insects to construct their cells in this way for their prettiness! To us duller mortals it is not apparent that the "final cause" of coral insects was to be ready to have their stony buildings cracked open by geologists' hammers; we thought they had been made for an existence where, in the main, no human eye could see them; especially as the species was Pre-Adamite by myriads of years. Mr. Miller's notion of the design of creation seems to be very much akin to that of the old Scotch crone, who, whenever she beheld a beautiful young girl, had no other appreciation of her graces than to conceive "what a lovely corpse she would make."

Once more: while the currently received theory of the cosmogony is ingenious, it is at least doubtful whether the adjustment of all the phenomena of so complex a case to the hypothesis, has been, or can be, accurately carried out.

But until this is done, it is not demonstrated. If that scheme is true, then all the material substances which make up the chemist's list of simple substances, must have been derived from the elements of the atmosphere, of water, and of the primitive rocks. For, if we go back to the beginning, we find, according to the current hypothesis of the geologists, nothing in existence, except a heated atmosphere, watery vapor, and a fluid globe of melted granite, basalt, etc. All the rest, secondary, tertiary, alluvial, is the result of cooling, crusting, depressions and upheavals of this crust, disintegration, and sedimentary deposites. But, is it certain that air, pure water, and primitive rocks, contain all the chemical substances? And a still harder question is this: Has it ever been ascertained whether the chemical conditions and combinations, in which the elements exist in the primary rocks, and then in those called secondary and tertiary, are such as are consistent with this hypothesis? Has it been ascertained that the small per-centage of silicate of lime found in some of the granites (only some) and other primitive rocks, within such a distance from their surface as could, by any possibility, be subjected to disintegration, can account for all the vast masses of *carbonate* of lime (no longer silicate) in all the limestones, marbles, chalks, coral, and calcareous clays of the newer strata? But the world is entitled to have these questions answered, before the geologists claim a demonstration of their hypothesis.

Recent events furnish us with another doubt. One of the main arguments by which the fossil animals of all but the most recent species are shown to be Pre-Adamite, as it is claimed, is, that no fossil human remains, or marks of human handiwork, have been found among them. And geologists have admitted (as they must) that the well-attested discovery of such remains among the earlier strata would demand a surrender and reconstruction of their theory. But lately the scientific world has been agitated by the report that, near *Amiens*, in France, arrow heads of

flint, and other works of human industry, have been found unquestionably in a *stratum*, and along with fossils, uniformly assigned by geologists to a Pre-Adamite period. And now, it is stated that a scholar of high qualifications, Rawlinson, has visited the spot, and is satisfied of the correctness of the assertion.

For these and many other reasons, we consider the geological hypothesis as not yet a demonstration; and, hence, we claim the right to stand upon the defensive, upon the impregnable bulwarks of Scripture evidences, until we are positively dislodged. We deny that any logical obligation rests upon us to present any scientific argument, or to establish any hypothesis, on the subject. We are not bound to show, by natural science, what is the true *rationale* of the earth's creation. Our defence is thoroughly accomplished when we show that any adverse theory is not yet exclusively demonstrated.

5. The most vital point in the relations between theology and geology, we have reserved for the last. It is one which has been summarily disposed of by geologists, without condescending to weigh its vast import. How far must the logical value of the inferences of natural science from natural appearances, be modified by the admitted fact of *a creation?* The character of these inferences is the following: "We see a given natural law produce a given structure: We find the remains of a similar structure which has been some how produced in the past: We infer that it must have been produced by a similar natural law." The just application of this kind of reasoning, within its proper limits, is fully admitted: it has been the main lever in the discoveries of natural science. But now, we ask, how far should its application be limited by the knowledge of the truth, that *some where* in the past some omnipotent creative act must have intervened? This is the question.

Unless geologists are willing candidly to take an atheistic view of cosmogony, the fact of an absolute act of creation

must be admitted some where in the past. We will not insult the intelligence and piety of our readers by supposing it necessary to recite the arguments which disprove an Atheistic origin of the present order of things, or the emphatic admissions of all the greatest teachers of natural science, that nature obviously discloses her own origin in the creative will of an eternal Intelligence. The short-lived theory of *development* has been already crushed beneath the combined arguments and ridicule of scientific geologists themselves. There is, however, one fact, peculiarly germain to this point, that the Christian geologists of Great Britain and America claim it as the peculiar glory of their science, that it presents an invincible and original argument for a creation. It is this: the stony records of successive *genera* of fossil plants and animals show that prior *genera* perished wholly, and *genera* entirely new appear on the stage of life. Now, as the development theory is repudiated, the entrance of each new *genus* evinces, beyond a doubt, a new and separate creative act. Let us grant this for argument's sake. It is agreed, then, that terrestrial structures began, some where in the past, in God's creative act.

But now, it is most obvious, that if a scientific observer had been present, just after that creative act, to observe the structures produced by it, any observations or inferences he might have drawn from the *seeming* marks of the working of natural laws upon them, would have been worthless to prove that those specimens originated in natural laws. We repeat: once admit that a creative act has intervened *any where* in the past, and we should have had there, if we had been present, one case, in which all deductions and inferences of the natural origin of things from their natural appearances, would have been worthless. Such analogical arguments would have been cut across and superseded utterly by the creative act. This is indisputable. We may illustrate it by the instances usually pre-

sented by the sound old writers of the class of Dick (instances which have far more significance than has usually been admitted). Suppose, for illustration's sake, that the popular apprehension of the Bible account of the creation of Adam's body, and of the trees of Paradise, is true. But now a naturalist of our modern school investigates affairs. He finds towering oaks with acorns on them! Acorns do not form by nature in a day—some species of oaks require two summers to mature them. But, worse than this. He has ascertained by natural history that one summer's growth forms only one of the concentric rings in the grain of the tree's stock. He cuts down one of the spreading monarchs of the garden, and discovers that it has a hundred rings. So he coolly rejects the story that this garden began last week, and insists on it that Adam has told a monstrous fib in saying so; that it is not less than a hundred years old. Yet Adam was right; for the creative act explained all. But let us suppose another naturalist returning after some nine or ten centuries. He visits the venerable tomb of the father of all the living, and learns from his heir, Seth, how that his father sprang, at the bidding of God, out of the dust, a full-formed, adult man. The naturalist takes up a leg-bone of Adam's skeleton: he remarks: "The person to whom this bone belonged at death was evidently an adult; for its length, size, solidity and density show this." He saws off a section, polishes it down to a translucent film of bone, and subjects it to his microscope and his chemical solvents. He remarks: "Here is the cellular structure of gelatinous matter, which once formed the incipient bone of the *fœtus;* and these cells I now find filled with the deposite of *proto-phosphate of lime*, giving it its stony strength and hardness. But I know that the introduction of this earth into the cells of the soft bone of the infant is just the process by which nature now forms the bones of adults, by gradual growth. Whence I learn that this individual, like his children, grew, during

the space of twenty-one years, from a *fœtus* to an adult; and the myth of his son Seth, concerning his instantaneous creation, is an attempt to impose on my credulity. This attempt I, as a philosopher, shall repudiate with contempt." Yet Seth was right, and the philosopher wrong. For, not to rely on the inspired testimony alone, this natural argument would prove that Adam was once an infant, and, therefore, had a father. The same argument, applied to the body of Adam's father, would equally prove that he, also, was once an infant, and had a father. And it would prove equally well an infinite series of finite human fathers, extending back to all eternity. But such a series, philosophy herself shows, is impossible!

But, second—and the remark is of prime importance—any creative act of God, producing a structure which was intended to subsist under the working of natural laws, must produce one presenting some of the *seeming* traces of the operation of such laws. We confidently challenge geologists who admit that there has ever been any creation at all, to imagine a product of it which could be different. For, note, all these Theistic geologists repudiate the theory of development of *genera* from different and lower *genera*. Whence it follows, that the first specimen of God's immediate handiwork, the very first moment it left his hand, must have stood forth *as truly natural* as any of its progeny which were destined to proceed from it by natural law. And the same thing must have been true, to some extent, of all inorganic structures. If they had no traits of the natural, as they came from God's hand, then they were incapable of becoming, thenceforth, the subjects of natural law.

Hence, third, it follows that, if once a creative act is admitted to have occurred some where in the past, it may have occurred any where in the past, so far as the deductions of natural science from the marks of natural law upon its products go. In other words, the value of all

these analogical inferences as to the date at which, and the mode by which, these objects of nature came into being, are worthless just so soon as they attempt to pass back of the earliest historical testimony. For the creative act, wherever it has intervened (and who can tell, when testimony fails, where it may not have intervened?) has utterly superseded and cut across all such inferences. Nor can these natural analogies prove that the creative act has not thus intervened at a given place in the past, because the whole validity of the analogies depends on the supposed absence of the creative act. Hence, all the reasonings of geologists seem to us utterly vitiated in their very source, when they attempt to fix, from natural analogies, the age and mode of production of the earth's structures.

This objection is usually dismissed by geologists with a sort of summary contempt, or with a grand outcry of opposition. It does, indeed, cut deep into the pride and pretence of their science; at one blow it sweeps off that whole domain of its pretended discoveries—the region of the infinite past prior to all history—in which the pride, conceit, and curiosity of man's fallen intellect must crave to expatiate. But let us see whether it is possible to impugn the simple premises on which our conclusion rests, or the inevitable result from them. Is there a single answer which can be presented, that is even of any scientific weight?

It is urged, in substance, by Hitchcock, that if the validity of their analogical reasonings from natural laws is denied in this case, the very foundations of all natural science are overthrown. But what is this, more than an appeal to our fears and prejudices? It is as though one said, when we refuse to accept a given species of evidence outside its proper range, that we thereby invalidate the force of all evidence. The question is: What is the proper domain of these inferences from the analogies of natural law? Within their own domain, true science accepts them as

valid; outside of it, true science herself will concur with theology in arresting them. Let these premises be granted, viz: Given the sufficient evidence that supernatural causes are all absent in a certain class of effects; and given the fact that just such effects have usually resulted from a certain natural law: Then the inference may be very valid, that these effects did result from the operation of this law. But this inference can not help us to determine the first premise, whether all supernatural causes were truly absent; for the very reason that it depends on that premise in part. This would be to reason in a circle, with a vengeance. The application of these inferences, upon which Hitchcock and the other geologists insist, is, in fact, precisely a case of that induction, from mere uniformity of antecedent and consequent, as far as observed, which Bacon condemned under the term "*Inductio per enumerationem simplicem*," and which it was one of his chief tasks to explode, as utterly worthless. He proves that it can never raise more than a meager probability of the correctness of its conclusions, where it is not supported by some better canon of induction. To explain: The shallow observer says—"I find that, so far as my observation has been enabled to test the matter, a given consequent phenomenon, named B, has always been preceded by a given antecedent, named A. Hence, I conclude that, in every other case where B appears, A was its cause." The obvious vice of this is, that it is wholly unproved that some other cause capable of producing B was not present, besides A, in the last cases. The induction is worthless until that is proved beyond a peradventure. To apply this: Our modern geologists argue, for instance, that wherever they have been able to examine the actual process by which the formation of *stratified rocks* takes place, the cause is *sedimentary action.* Therefore, wherever any other stratified rocks are seen, their producing cause must have been sedimentary action. Here we have precisely the worthless induction *per enumerationem*

simplicem; for, the possible presence of some other cause capable of producing stratified rocks, has not been excluded. And every one but the Atheist admits that another such cause may have been present, in the shape of *creative power.* Until the presence of that cause is excluded by some other evidence, the conclusion is not proved. The vice of argument is just like that in the famous sophism of Hume against miracles—it is only worthy of a Humist. And we conceive that there is no uncharitableness in declaring that the covert tendencies of all such philosophizings are to Hume's Atheism. Such reasonings can not be complete for such a result in all cases, unless the supernatural be wholly excluded; and the secret tendency to do so (which is virtual Atheism) is the true spring of all such reasonings in science. But it may be retorted: Are we, then, to surrender all dependence on inferences from natural law, as certain evidence, throughout the whole extent of natural sciences? We reply: No; wherever the inquirer into nature is certain that the facts he investigates are truly under the dominion of natural law, so far such reasonings are valid. As to the origin and history of nature in the past, they are valid no farther back than we can be assured of the absence of the supernatural; and we know not how such assurance can be gained by us, save by the testimony of human experience and history, or of inspiration. This conclusion does, indeed, curb the arrogance of human science, but it does not affect in the least any part of its legitimate dominions, or of its practical value to mankind. It does, indeed, disable us from determining the age, date, and origin of the structures nature presents us, but it does not prevent our discovering the laws of those structures; and the latter is the discovery to which the whole utility of science belongs.

Again: why should the Theistic philosopher desire to push back the creative act of God to the remotest possible age, and to reduce His agency to the smallest possible *mini-*

mum, as is continually done by these speculations? What is gained by it? Instead of granting that God created *a world*, a κοσμος, they continually strive to show that he only created the rude germs of a world, attributing the actual origin of the fewest possible elements to God's almighty act, and supposing the most possible to be the result of subsequent development under natural law. We repeat the question: What is truly gained by this, if once the lingerings of covert Atheism be expelled? Admit in good faith the facts of an actual Creator, an almighty and omniscient agent, and of an actual creation, any where in the past, and it will appear just as reasonable that God should have created the whole finished result as a part. To His infinite faculties there is nothing hard, as opposed to easy, nothing intricate, as opposed to simple, nothing great, as contrasted with the simple. It was just as easy for Him to speak into existence a finished universe, with all its beautiful order, "by the word of His power," as to produce the incipient elements out of which "laws of nature" were slowly and laboriously to evolve the result.

For, what are those laws of nature, and what their source? Do they not originate, after all, in the mere will and immediate power of God? None but the Atheist disputes this. And, although we cordially grant that the properties of bodies, by which they are constituted *forces* in the great system of causation under natural law, are actual properties, and not mere seeming blinds or *simulacra* of properties; though we grant that they are truly intrinsic in bodies, as constituted by God's creative will; yet who, except the Atheist, denies that their operation is sustained and regulated by the ever-present, special providence of God? Hence, if we say *natural law* does this or that, as opposed to supernatural creation, we have not in the least simplified, or relieved, the perpetual miracle of God's working. There is still a manifold and countless operation of infinite power and wisdom.

But, if the natural philosophers still persist in claiming the universal application of their principle, that wherever there is an analogy to the results of natural law, there we must conclude natural law alone has wrought, we can clearly evince that their position is utterly untenable and inconsistent, save for the thorough Atheist. For, as already intimated, push back the supernatural creative intervention as far as we may, it is impossible for us to conceive how it could produce any structure adapted to the subsequent dominion of natural law, without giving it the properties which such law gives to its similar products. To give the most complete proof of the justice of this remark, let us take that theory of the solar system which the unbelieving *La Place* is said to have doubtfully suggested as a possible one, and which our nominally Christian philosophers have so incontinently adopted, without demonstration, as demonstratively the true one. Suppose that the natural historian, coming from some older system, had begun his investigation of ours (on the principles of these philosophers) at that stage when nothing existed but a *nebula* of incandescent compound vapor, rotating from west to east around an axis of motion. (This is the stage, we understand, at which it is now most popular to suppose cooling, liquefying, and solidifying processes began, resulting in a sun and planets; when the only shadow of truly scientific evidence on which *La Place* grounded his doubtful surmise, has been dissipated by Lord Rosse, resolving the *nebulæ* into clusters of well-defined stars.) How would this scientific observer have speculated on what was presented at that primitive stage? Had he used the confident logic of our geologists, he must have said to himself: "Motion in matter is always the result of impact; therefore, this rotary motion which I now behold must be the result of some mechanical force, developed by natural action, either mechanical or chemical. And again: *vapor* implies *evaporation*, and sensible heat suggests latent heat, rendered

sensible by chemical action. There must, therefore, have been a previous and different condition of this matter, now volatilized, heated, and moving. These conditions are the results of the working of natural laws; and that implies a previous material, in a different condition, to be the subject of that working." Now, this reasoning would be precisely as good as that of geologists. But what would it prove? It would make matter and the organism thereof eternal; for, after ascending by such reasonings one stage higher, we should be equally impelled to ascend still another, and another. Thus it would exclude a Creator totally from creation. Hence, it appears that the principles we have criticised are unsound and inconsistent, in any hands except those of the Atheist. Once admit a Creator and a creation, and the validity of all inferences from the seeming analogies of nature, as to origin of things, is vitiated the moment we pass back of the authentic light of historical testimony. Once admit a Creator and a creation, and nothing is gained, in logic, by attempting to push back the creative act.

In fine, if that account which theology gives of the origin of the universe is to be accepted at all, it appears to us that the most philosophical conception of a creation would be the following: That God, in producing a world which His purposes required should pass immediately under the dominion of natural laws, would produce it with just the properties which those laws were to develope. Thus God, intending to have trees perpetuated by a law of germination and growth, would most naturally create the first tree of the *genus* just such as germination and growth would produce. And so, the whole structure of His world would be made, at first, with an adaptation to the laws which were intended subsequently to regulate and modify it. And just here theology inosculates with cosmogony, and gives us a consideration which will strike every just mind with no little force, while it is one of that kind which

the man of narrow specialities is almost incompetent to estimate. What was God's true end in the creation of a material world? Reason and Scripture answer: It was to furnish a stage for the existence and action of reasonable moral beings. The world was made for MAN to inhabit. Without the presence of this its rational occupant and earthly master, all the manifestations of intelligent design and moral attributes, given in the order of nature, would be an aimless and senseless work. For, as light would be no light were there no *eye* in the universe, so God's declarative glory in the wisdom and goodness of His works is no glory till there is a *mind* to comprehend it. Now, such being God's end, it seems far more rational to suppose that God would produce at once the world which was needed for His purpose, rather than spend hundreds of thousands of years in growing it.

But, bearing in mind the object for which God created a world, we shall see that it becomes the most reasonable supposition that He should have made it, from the first, with some of those traits which geologists suppose have all resulted from the working of natural laws. For instance: God's purposes, as at present revealed, prompted Him to subject the surface of our globe to that class of agencies which are continually adding to its sedimentary *strata* of rocks and earths. Well, it is the most reasonable, the most philosophic, supposition that the same purposes prompted Him to create a globe which had, from the first, some *strata* of the same sort. That the surface of the globe should be from the first stratified was necessary, for instance, to produce springs and veins of water, and that whole economy of irrigation, which makes it a tenable home for sentient creatures.

If, therefore, there is any authentic testimony that God did, from the first, create such an earth, no sound inference drawn from natural analogies is of any force to rebut that testimony.

ARTICLE IV.

"*The Art of Extempore Speaking: Hints for the Pulpit, the Senate, and the Bar.* By M. BAUTAIN, Professor at the Sorbonne," etc.

M. Bautain is himself one of the most brilliant extempore orators in France, a country abounding in masters of the art of ready eloquence. He has, therefore, a certain right to call the ear of mankind to the great subject of public speaking, seeing that he is a practical and successful exemplifier of its principles. For those who, by popular speech, would influence their fellow-men, he authoritatively lays down rules, which have all been tested in his own rich experience. They are not abstractions. They are not the results of *a priori* reasoning, based upon the nature of the human mind, or wire-drawn from the philosophy of rhetoric. They do not come to us perched upon Blair's brittle stilts of ice, with nothing human about them. They have passed through the mill of actual experiment. The entire book has this to say: What is here described, *has been done;* try the receipt, O fellow-orators, for yourselves! It is not surprising that this masterly essay upon a most difficult, and even recondite, subject—this fresh, vigorous, limpid outpouring of an elocutionary expert—should have met with the favor which has greeted it in our own country; for among a free people the cultivation of effective oratory is recommended by the very character of their institutions. Moreover, it is a book the very graces of whose composition would themselves give it currency with all who love vivid writing, original illustration, and enthusiasm.

It is not our purpose to review this entertaining and instructive volume, but to make it the starting-point for

some observations touching the bearing of its subject upon the oratory of the pulpit.

We can readily imagine the delight with which such a treatise might be hailed on the part of those who believe that the time has fully come for imparting to our pulpits the impulse of a new energy, and who think that this energy resides in the art of extemporaneous address, in contradistinction from written homilies. A numerous class of judicious Christians are convinced that the introduction of a freer style of public speaking into the sacred desk will be vastly promotive of ministerial efficiency. Many newspaper and periodical writers have, within a few years, been greatly exercised with respect to what they regard the comparative unfruitfulness of the *Presbyterian* Church, particularly, in the instrumental work of human salvation. In accounting for this alleged barrenness, these reformers immediately arraign the pulpit at the bar of public opinion, and denounce *it* as the prime hinderer of that work, by its inapt and lifeless mode of presenting truth to the conscience. They say: Give us a living pulpit, and we will show you a living Church; give us the breath of excited oratory, and we will show you the kindling of excited emotion; give us an unreading ministry, and we will show you an unsleeping auditory: as if these propositions were all identical. These persons would, in their zeal, send a copy of Bautain's work to each theological student, and to every young preacher, and to the hundreds of dull prosers who have passed their pupilage, and are no longer young, with the request that they study at the feet of this master, acquire his art of free extemporization, and learn to thunder at the people with the artillery of his off-hand eloquence. This would usher in the millenium!

We think that those who thus feel—for feeling it is, rather than sober thought—are in a great degree mistaken; pulpit oratory may be just as effective when its power is wielded by the "manuscript" preacher, as when it is exem-

plified by the "extempore" speaker. The secret of inefficient preaching does not lie here at all, in our humble judgment, but far elsewhere. We do, indeed, readily grant that no preaching is worthy of the name which does not possess a certain power, considered as an instrumental human agency, by which the mind of the preacher can impress its own convictions of truth upon the mass of mind which waits upon it for instruction from time to time. There are sympathies to be awakened between speaker and hearer. There are arts to be employed for winning confidence, for enlisting attention, for awakening thought, and for persuading to action. This is all well understood. But the question is: Does extemporaneous preaching alone meet all the demands of the case? We embrace the negative. In its discussion we will, as briefly as possible, consider the three points which seem to constitute the kernel of this controversy: 1. The standard of extemporization which is ordinarily raised for the preacher's imitation. 2. The only kind of this mode of public address which is deserving of emulation by the pulpit orator, but which will be found impracticable in the main. 3. The nature of preaching, and what essential popular qualities it seems to demand, but which will be found to appertain to the judicious use of the manuscript as surely as to the opposite mode of presenting or enforcing divine truth.

I.

It is well known to every one who has read the literature belonging to this subject, or who has listened to occasional conversations relating to it, that the regret is commonly expressed, to the effect that the style of pulpit oratory does not more resemble the declamation of the lawyer and the politician. This comparison between the rostrum and the sacred desk is almost spontaneously resorted to by every individual who wishes to convince the preacher and the people whom he addresses that all *jejune* sermonizing

owes its origin to a lack of those popular elements which characterize the bar and the "stump." The court-room and the hustings—or, at any rate, the halls of legislation—present the true standard of effective speaking. Now, it is difficult to meet this mode of argumentation, because of its vagueness. We are disposed to believe that, whenever it is employed, the mind of the pulpit-censor is fixing his thoughts, not upon the "common run" of lawyers, etc., but only upon some master-spirit of their number, who stands out prominent before them all, and who may be one of those commanding geniuses, whose eminent abilities enable him to adorn and exalt his class—upon some Webster, or some Preston, or some Stephens, the native strength of whose minds, and the graces of whose rhetoric, and the marvels of whose elocution, in connection with whose legal and other attainments, make them the objects of a general and an enthusiastic admiration. They say: Fill the pulpits of the land with the sanctified oratorical abilities of *such* men, and you will move the world towards Christ with an irresistible impulse. Before we get through, we will see reason to doubt even this conclusion, and to believe that *God's* plan, which makes exceptional instances of greatness like this so rare in the Church, is the best plan.

But, surely, if our opponents mean, after all, to point us for our exemplars to the second, third, or still lower rates of speakers who crowd the courts, or bawl from the stump, or prose in the legislatures, we tell them that they are very wide of the mark. We are compelled to say that, while upon the arena of the law there is quite often a fine, perhaps brilliant, display of forensic power—while we have frequently found occasion to admire the off-hand readiness with which great pleaders hurled their telling points upon electrified juries—yet very few of our innumerable legal advocates *ever* make a very creditable display of themselves or their causes, with all their supposed cultivation of unstudied address!

We do not hesitate to declare, what every man of taste well knows, that, as a common thing, the haranguing of the bar belongs to a very low order of oratory: it is only now and then relieved by the magnificent speech of some deservedly eminent barrister. Of all the slip-shod rhetoric to which we have ever listened—of all the common-place fustian with which the ear of cultivation was ever disgusted—of all the tedious tautologies with which language has been watered and weakened—of all the ungrammatical blundering with which the poor English tongue has ever been disgraced, on the part of those who ought to know better—some of the worst specimens are any day to be found in those pleadings of the bar to which preaching is exhorted to listen for instruction in the art of successful extempore address! Turn all of our preachers into the department of the law, and turn all of your lawyers into the department of the Gospel, and we hazard nothing in saying that the pulpit would be the worse for the ill-advised exchange, whilst the bar would be vastly elevated by the (to it) advantageous transfer. It is mainly because the lawyer deals with facts of present material interest to a number of persons among his audience—with principles so affecting the life and property of all his hearers as to make every case in court personal to each individual in the community—it is because he is addressing a jury or a court whose responsibility is always pressing—it is more because of matters entirely extraneous from himself than on account of the intrinsic excellencies of his oratory, that he obtains the hearing and wins the applause which he does so often secure. Bid not the preacher go, therefore, to the place where eloquence is in itself so seldom winning, if you would have him learn the best mode of declaring the counsel of God. Nor, when you translate the lawyer from the court-house to the political meeting, does the matter become any better. If noise, if ranting, if rambling incoherency, if the employment of gross epithetic abuse, if the

glib recitation of stale maxims, if voluble caricaturing of national history—if all this, relieved now and then by an occasional flash of unoriginal wit, can indicate the possession of the elements of genuine oratory, then is your stump-speaker a rival of Demosthenes! And how easy would it be to introduce such speaking into the sacred desk, for the entertainment of the Sabbath-day assemblies! Aye, how often has it been done! The most complete exemplification of the politician's catching arts of special pleading is found in the anti-Gospel stump-oratory of H. W. Beecher, wherein extemporaneous anathemas are hurled with pleasing effect upon the devoted substance of every good thing in heaven and on earth! This madman has many imitators, who have degraded the inspiration of extempore genius infinitely below the point of their master's example, and who have proved themselves well qualified to take oratorical grade with the rank and file of the inferior orders of political ranters! God save the pulpit generally from the ability to pour out their favorite streams of much-relished waters of strife! Ignorance has always, in the pulpit and out of it, laid hold of this mode of gaining the ears of men—this method of raw improvising—this flaunting *dishabille* of undressed thought—this storming of the mind by a mob of undrilled words—for the purpose of exciting easily captivated feeling and of deadening judgment. Need I point the reader to hundreds of instances where the peculiarities of the lawyer and the politician have been transferred to the pulpit, in the persons of preachers who care more to gain sectaries than to win souls to Christ in God's appointed way? Is not the Church already too full of extemporaneous speakers, whose noisy platitudes possess interest mainly to the *denomination* whose favorite doctrines or forms they uphold by stress of voice, by occasional "hits," and by ministering to prejudice, but which have no great influence in promoting the permanent welfare of mankind, and in placing immovable stones in the uprising temple of grace?

Their inspiration lies in warmth of blood, in mechanically strung nerves, and in a boldness of official dogmatism, which nothing can ever put to the blush.

II.

But it will be said that no sane man pleads for the introduction of such pure and such dangerous extemporeity into the pulpit—that what is needed is the *finished* art of unhampered eloquence, implying qualities of mind and breadth of learning far beyond what is ordinarily witnessed at the bar, or amongst the confused crowd of ignorant declaimers in certain denominations. We even wish for some thing better and nobler than the products of legislative elocution. Yes; no doubt every thinking man must shrink from that portraiture of the sacred desk, which might be drawn were the oratory of any but first-rate lawyers and eminent statesmen to characterize it. Let us take for granted, therefore, that the popular demand is unreasonable and foolish which asks for a repetition of the common style of court-room palaver in the history of sacred oration. Let us turn from the picture we have presented, to some thing more attractive. Speaking after the manner of men, and apart from the mind of God in the premises, let us see what *is* required of the preacher, if his public efforts would, upon ordinary principles, equal the demands of the great end which is proposed to him.

Any one will think that he can discover, at a glance, that the preacher who is eminently *skilled* in the noble art of free extemporization possesses certain capital advantages. Look at them. He can command his audience with the speaking eye. He can excite attention by gesticulatory action. He can carry conviction by a species of boldness which at once commands the will. The passion of the speaker, involuntarily aroused, may burst forth of a sudden in some sublime strain of feeling which must needs tell upon a sympathizing auditory. Vivid emotion and

energetic expression are often the pure product of extempore speaking. A brilliancy sometimes sparkles in the words, a majesty sometimes clothes the thoughts, a kind of inspiration sometimes opens up to view the similitude of the soul to divinity, which no other order or style of speech can reach. Even greater force and decision may thus be brought sometimes to bear upon the subject in hand. Words will often be warm and fresh beyond what they could be if chosen in the study. There is frequently a spring and a vigor attending the excitement of free oratory, which makes the argument of the harangue tell upon the convictions as nothing but the energy of instantaneous effort or the concentrated power of a sudden burst can. The very necessity of unpremeditated production is calculated to give stimulus to thought, and command to manner, and vitality to style of expression. The orator may even go beyond himself, and seem to be under the guidance of a mind superior to the one of which, in his ordinary moments, he is conscious; enjoying those moments of indescribable luxury when, throwing the reins upon the neck of his cloud-climbing steed, he seems to have no command over it any longer, but is hurried into hitherto unknown regions of blissful emotion or glorious thought:

"Fertur equis auriga, neque audit currus habenas."

And this spontaneous flight is always upon wings which are able to bear along the surprised and captivated audience. But, leaving out of view these exceptional flashes of unexpectedly aroused genius, the extempore orator is, more commonly, enabled to leave the track of his discourse and delight his auditory, by kindling many a little blaze of illustration upon some side path in the general region of his discourse, which never could have occurred to him amid the chills and labors of pen-and-ink thought. And, what is better than all, he can, upon occasion, be familiar in his phraseology, and *converse* with his hearers as

if alone with them, each by himself. If, moreover, his speech threaten to prove weary, he can readily ward off the approaching tedium by changing the current of his remarks, and conducting them, for a time at least, into more taking channels of instruction. In truth, the skilled master of the art of off-hand speaking is a temporary monarch, whose will is law, and whose sway is almost absolute.

It is no wonder, therefore, that there are men, zealous for the glory of God, who would gladly introduce this royal gift of oratory into all our pulpits. Having in their mind's eye many illustrations of its power in other departments of influence—nay, looking over the history of the Church, and having their vision glowing with high scenes of successful elocution, in which a Masillon, a Bourdaloue, a Bossuet, a Hall, have carried whither they would their overwhelmed and subjugated congregations—they have naturally imagined that, if all the pulpits in the land were filled with such unfettered spokesmen of the Gospel, the cause of Christ would rapidly hasten on to its consummation in the latter-day glory! And, truly, regarding the matter from a mere earthly point of contemplation, these reformers of clerical oratory would seem to be right. So far as we can see, it might contribute immensely to the success of preaching if *angels* should come down—or, at least, reëmbodied saints—and preach to the world in such flaming speech as heaven could lend them. Or, it would be well, were the apostles to return to earth, accompanied by the long line of ancient prophets, and give forth arousing volumes of inspired breath, to kindle the world into a blaze of sudden Godliness. Indeed, the advocates of extemporaneous preaching are accustomed to go back to the early days of the Church, and sigh over the lost oratory of *Noah*, as he stood warning mankind upon the completing deck of his ark; of *Nathan*, as he hurled truth with lightning directness upon the conscience of his king; of *Ezra*, as he expounded the word from hour to hour in Jerusalem; of

Peter, as he proclaimed the merits of Christ on the day of Pentecost; of *Paul*, as he astounded philosophy from the sublime pulpit of Mar's Hill; of *Apollos*, who, from deep fountains of Gospel-truth, watered the Churches. Or, if these enthusiastic admirers of the unfettered preacher do not go back so far, and gather up such inappropriate instances of *inspired* eloquence with which to startle the consciences of modern sermonizers, they at least stand with admiring wonder before the image of a Luther, extemporizing at Worms; of the Scottish Reformers, improvising discourses full of consolation amid the caves of persecution; of Whitefield, that child of Reformation, pouring over a dead establishment the fiery floods of God's forgotten truth; of the Blairs and Tennants, especially called of heaven to lay the foundation-stones of our American Zion. Would to God such men could be given to the Church in every generation, and continued to her down to the last moment of time! But they are exceptional cases: we believe designedly exceptional. The Head of the Church has not seen fit to repeat, often, those heroes who fought so valiantly "upon the high places of the field."

But, then, when our friends on the other side of this controversy are driven from the argument which is founded upon these picked cases of inimitable pulpit-greatness, they fall back upon the well-knowing saying of Quintilian, "*fiunt oratores, nascuntur poetæ*," and affirm that the best oratorical talent can be *acquired*. It is, therefore, they urge, within the reach of all who are not too old to learn. They, of course, insist upon our preachers possessing the *best* oratorical talent. For it surely requires this, according to their views, to enable the Gospel-herald to blow full and clear and arousing blasts through his trumpet. Their opposition is to *dull* preaching, of whatever style; and intolerably dull is a prosy or a frothy extemporizer. The mere fact of his having no manuscript before him does not carry him up to the height where the demanded men of off-hand

effort are to stand for Christ. No; they must be *orators*, in the proper sense of that word. Now, have our opponents ever seriously reflected upon the historic truth, that there never have been *many* orators in the world? Or, if they please to put it otherwise, there have been in no age of the world many masters of the extempore style of speaking. And why? Because excellence in this mode of public address imperatively demands *genius*, requires high cultivation, and must possess the most favorable opportunities for practice, to say nothing about many subordinate qualities of person, of mind, of manners. A great orator is the growth of a century. A great pulpit orator is the wonder of an age. A man who can compel the same people to listen to the stale truths of revelation year in and year out, by the force of an oratory which has around it none of the appearances of study, but whose never-repeated images of truth always appear to issue spontaneously from the exhaustless depths of a great soul—such a semi-inspired genius God grants to mankind as rarely as He does a poet who might take rank with Milton, or a scientific discoverer who may rival Newton, or a brilliant historian who can compare with Macaulay. They are marvels.

But, O Reformer, you say that you do not look for such marvels. But you *do:* perhaps without knowing it. You set up such a standard of perfection, and plead for its attainment in every pulpit. If you do not, all your sighing, and regretting, and pleading, are to no purpose—mere empty breath. We will, however, accommodate ourselves to your wishes upon a somewhat lower ground. We will describe to you BAUTAIN'S extemporizer, of which he thinks there may be numerous samples among his professional readers. We will show you the mark towards which he thinks every one should aim who has any hope of becoming the influential man he might be; and in the light of this showing, we will ask you if we are wrong in saying that such a standard can never be reached, save by a fa-

vored few, and that, if reaching it be essential to success as a preacher, nineteen twentieths of the existing ministry must be swept from the field they are disgracing.

Bautain's enumeration of the qualities which an extempore orator, who can reasonably expect enduring success in his profession, presents a list perfectly appalling. He says that nature must have implanted within the candidate for popular favor, in this line of influence, a lively sensibility, a penetrating intelligence, a sound reason, a prompt imagination, a firm and decisive will, an inborn necessity compelling him to expand his subject when once touched, and a certain instinct, which urges a man to speak as a bird to sing. How many men are there who possess such an array of shining qualities as the generous gifts of all-lavishing nature? And, then, this is only the sub-stratum—this assemblage of great parts constitutes merely the foundation on which to build. This rich furniture for the basis of extempore oratory must be supplemented by such a fund of ideas, such a treasury of learning, such a mastery of logic, such an acquaintance with the difficult and concealed art of thinking, such a command of words, such a familiarity with all the possible turns of speech, to say nothing of the voice, the articulation, the oratorical action!—why, where shall the enumeration stop? But we must go on a little further. It is certain, as Bautain teaches us, that no one can be a first-rate speaker unless he has long been in the habit of taking thought to pieces and again putting it together, is familiar with the art of writing correctly, clearly and elegantly, is conscious of a capacity for the handling of language at will, and without effort, has ability to construct sentences suddenly, without stoppages or faults, enjoys the power of ready and intelligent declamation, possesses a neat, distinct and emphatic utterance, knows how to maintain a good carriage of body, can wield an easy expression and graceful gesticulation, and is able to crown all with manners that distinguish the per-

son by a certain air not characterizing ordinary mortals! What an array of qualifications, to be sure! Who has them all? How many have the *most* of them, in a respectable degree? Alas, for the Church, if she has to wait for her millenial garments at the hands of extempore preachers who must be born in a pattern of excellence so exquisitely moulded!

We do know, indeed, that, when our pulpit-reformers would revolutionize the oratorical manners of so many excellent men, they are not in the habit of distinctly bringing up before their view such an exhibition of the extempore speaker as we have presented. But it is only in such a way that we can show them what they themselves want, and illustrate the utter unreasonableness of their expectations. They mean to elevate the "readers" whom they denounce into orators whom they can praise, or they mean nothing. But, can they praise any but *good* orators? And where will they find these good orators? In those denominations whose public sentiment frowns the manuscript out of sight? Surely, they look *there* in vain, except as their eyes may fasten upon one and another rare example of occasional excellence in the style of oratory. Do they direct us to the arena of the law, and to the field of politics? We have already seen that their direction thitherward is marked with thoughtlessness. Do they, therefore, say that, although no where will you discover the ideal for which the pleading is made, yet this ideal may yet be realized, by introducing a proper system of instruction into your schools, academies, and colleges? Well, it may be so. We will not discuss such a may-be. We prefer to deal with facts. And we, moreover, think there is a solution of the question in the inquiry: What is *God's* standard of pulpit acquirements? We may be sure that *His* is the best. Let us examine this, our last point, a little.

III.

The Scriptures abundantly teach the doctrine that no one is entitled to preach the Gospel who is not divinely called to the sacred office. A "call" to the ministry is, of course, not arbitrary, nor is it miraculous. It presupposes, in the man who believes that it is made to him, the possession of certain qualifications, natural, gracious, and acquired, with which, as so much evidence of his fitness, he is enabled to ascertain the fact of his "call," in the exercise of his reason and his conscience. He must have a good intellectual capacity—he ought to possess a fund of common sense—and his mind should enjoy the vigor which sound bodily health can alone impart to its energies. These are among his natural qualifications for a place among the authorized messengers of God. Crowning his mental life with its highest excellency, and penetrating it through and through with the power of an all-directing mastery, the ministerial aspirant or incumbent must possess a living, active, consistent, augmenting piety. This is the innermost kernel of his qualifications, bestowed upon him by the hand of grace. This is the indispensable jewel in that casket of treasures with which he is to enrich his hearers with salvation, as he discourses to them in the name of Jehovah. But, over and above—or, rather, along with—these natural and gracious gifts, he must have certain acquisitions, without which his pious efforts for the conversion of men can not be made to the best advantage, if they can be made at all, in his ministerial capacity. He must acquire habits of self-control, of diligence in study, and of easy knowledge-gaining. He must know how to rouse his intellect to action, to pursue the investigation of truth with successful ardor, to intensify thought upon a given point of inquiry. He must be a pains-taking gatherer of information from every field of learning within his reach, for various and fresh illustrations of the Word of

God. In one word, he must either become a practical *student*, or a——failure, in the long run. Men, moulded in such a pattern as we have thus hastily outlined, are those to whom God seems ordinarily to give the assurance of a ministerial "call," provided they are animated with the underlying desire to preach, as *their* best mode of doing good. This desire and these qualifications put the harness fairly upon them, other and minor things, easily suggesting themselves to the reader, being equal.

But why have we mentioned these qualifications? In order to make the inquiry: Wherein, among them, comes in the required *oratorical* status of the pulpited herald of the Cross? Doubtless, he ought to cultivate his voice, free his manner from defects, and make the best possible presentation of his great cause which nature and grace and culture will allow. But ought he to be an *extemporizer?* Is this the only *right* method of preaching, every other being only tolerated through expediency or necessity? The answer is found in the simple fact that the Holy Ghost has "called" to the ministry of His Word multitudes of men who could no more "extemporize" to edification, during a protracted term of preaching service in any given community, than they could fly. All men of moderate capacity, and of middling attainments, and of a share of boldness, can talk, can "spout," (to use an expressive vulgarism,) without cessation, can even say many good things in taking tones of voice—but we have already seen what it is to "extemporize" intelligently and well; and we ask, how many men are to be found, in the present ranks of the ministry, who are able to expound the Scriptures, in a manner either instructive or pleasing, without an amount and a concentration of studious effort which implies the use of the manuscript, or an equivalent writing down of daily thoughts upon the memory? At any rate, however this may be, certain it is that God has placed His clearest "call" in the hands of a large and an

influential class of preachers, who not only employ the manuscript mode of preparation for the pulpit, but whose minds are so constituted that this manner of influencing their fellow-men in offering to them the Gospel, was the only one left open to them from the first. This proposition, who can deny? But, if granted, what is the conclusion? Surely this, that *God's* estimate of preaching is not akin to that of our reformers, who so stoutly contend for the exclusive extempore method. It is evident that *He* does not regard the ability to preach without the "hampering use of notes," as *essential* to the saving power of the pulpit—that this is quite subordinate to other and higher qualifications—that the potency of that living voice, which gives efficacy to the presentation of truth, lies deeper than, and remote from, the gift of ready elocution; and that the success of the sermonized Gospel is more entirely under the will of a sovereign God than it can ever be dependent upon external forms of publication. It is certainly true, by the testimony of experience, that where there is piety, sense, knowledge, and single-eyed devotion to the cause of Christ, *there* is ministerial qualification in its *essence;* and that the presence or absence of oratorical gifts constitutes one of those circumstances which may assist, indeed, or retard the Word of God on certain occasions, but which belong rather to the shell than to the kernel of the matter. Who does not know that men of the most awkward address in the pulpit, of the clumsiest oratory, of the least attractive style of public speech, in its every phase, have been among the most successful in winning souls and in building up Churches? Examples will occur to any reader. But, are these classed among the exceptions? If so, why? It must be because these preachers had other and better and more vital qualifications than those which might have thrown a grace around their pulpit deliverances, and such as render this grace unimportant in the production of the effect. Well, this is all that

we are at present contending for: the truth that God does call men to preach who are not, and can not be, orators, in the ordinary sense of that abused word, and that He does, thereby, mean to teach us that preaching should strive to understand itself as a power, not after the manner of men, but altogether *sui generis*, and after the manner of the Lord.

What, then, is *true* pulpit oratory? The obvious answer is, That which best accomplishes the *appointed* ends of preaching. What are these? Mainly, two: The edification of the Church, and the conversion of sinners. The aim of the pulpit is instruction and persuasion. The man of God wishes, in Christ's name, to state clearly, and enforce strongly, the various points of saving truth which are intended to engage the understandings and enlist the hearts of his hearers. He imparts light, and desires to accompany it with heat. The real efficiency of the ordinance of preaching is undoubtedly wielded, instrumentally, by him who can open *God's Word* to the mind and conscience, in a manner the best calculated to serve the design of the Spirit in organizing this high department of moral effort; or who, in other words, becomes the Spirit's channel of communication with His people and the world. The truth which the Bible contains is itself the grand medium of salvation, and the expounder thereof is simply to bring it out and present it, so that what was theretofore concealed from the hearer may, by the accompanying power of grace, become efficacious to salvation. In proportion, therefore, to the fidelity with which the inspired volume is illuminated by means of the private studies and the public expositions of the preacher, in that proportion may he expect his labors to reach their end in sanctification and conversion. The herald of the Gospel must understand that, behind *him*, is another and more powerful herald, even the Holy Ghost. The *Spirit* is the *real* orator in the case. He is the true preacher; so entirely so, that

to Himself alone belongs all the praise of pulpit success. The sermonizer is not a mere public speaker, the accomplishment of whose ends is due altogether to the triumphs of his oratory. There is an end to be gained by the preacher which no human power—which no efforts of the rarest genius—can ever hope to reach. And, inasmuch as this principal end is gained purely through the agency of the Holy Ghost, it comes to be true that preaching is, as we have said, simply the official channel wherein that truth is to flow as freely as possible, and as untainted as possible. The whole duty of the pulpit, then, we again urge, is to set forth, in a manner as winning as its incumbent is able to employ, and by every art of faithful representation, the whole counsel of God pertaining to Christ and His proffered salvation. Now, it is as obvious that this may be done in a great variety of styles of thought, and of composition, and of delivery, as it is certain that the Almighty has laid His hand upon thousands of individuals, of all temperaments, of all tastes, of all peculiarities of manner, of all degrees of native talent, of all measures of learning, of all types of true piety, and bade them, each in his own best way, do the work of the ministry. It was so in His choice of those whom He designed as the channels of His original communication to mankind, through the revelation which He inspired them to deliver. All these organs of the Spirit were not moulded in the same pattern. Isaiah differed from Malachi, and John from Paul, yet all proclaimed the same great doctrines, while each did so in his own peculiar and self-distinguishing style. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." Look at the modern pulpit. One preacher *extemporizes* his discourses emphatically, and his loose, rambling sentences strike some minds with force, while his warmth of zeal stirs up kindred emotions in some hearts. Another has prepared his "heads," and, trusting to the inspiration of the occasion, fills in as he rushes along, or as he spasmodically

leaps from point to point, with such matter as lies conveniently to hand; this man often producing impressive thoughts, sometimes suggesting satisfactory explanations of important texts, now and then surpassing what he could do by the most careful study; and, notwithstanding his oft-repeated platitudes, and his ever-recurring pet phrases, is listened to with interest and profit by a large class of hearers. A third, resolving to have nothing to do with manuscripts, commits his sermons to memory, and, with steady countenance, and more or less unimpassioned manner, recites to half-sympathetic audiences his measured sentences. A fourth, committing his thoughts only to memory, launches out upon a bottomless sea of words, where wonder and piety follow him with edifying amazement. A fifth writes and reads his discourses—sometimes reads them slavishly; again, with freedom of manner akin to the declaimer; and again, with a mixture of the various styles of delivery, which afford a succession of pleasing changes. All these are successful, to a degree that is surprising, in winning souls and improving the graces of God's people. They are all employed by the Spirit in the one, but many-sided, work of salvation. They are, each in his own way, pulpit *orators—i. e.*, they are messengers sent of God to preach the Gospel—with a success proportioned, not to their adherence to this or that method of presenting truth, but to their holy zeal, to the nearness of access which their souls have had to the throne of grace, and to their determination to know only "Christ and Him crucified."

The fact is—every one knows it, because every one has felt it—that the one great, shining characteristic of preaching, as it is the organ of the Holy Ghost, is *earnestness.* Earnestness is eloquence in the pulpit. Nothing will atone for the absence of this quality, and its presence covers a multitude of faults. Does any one object to manuscript preaching, that *it* must necessarily lack this all-important element? The most truly earnest preachers we have ever

heard, delivered their discourses from written pages. The most earnest preachers ever heard in modern times—Chalmers, Davis, Edwards, and a host of others—were those who did not venture "to talk nonsense in the name of the Lord" by extemporaneous haranguing. The case of Edwards is a fine illustration of what seems to constitute real pulpit oratory. His was made up of two things, which, where they are united in the same discourse, will *always* produce a powerful effect—*solid Scriptural thought, and holy unction.* In the degree in which these are present, will the sermon be effective, whether read or delivered, by an Edwards or any body else. Indeed, we venture to say that it is particularly the latter quality—the indescribable unction which is obtained in prayer, in profound meditation upon divine truth, in a deep realization of the importance of eternal things to one's self and the world at large—it is *this* which gives its best and truest power to the pulpit. It is *not* manner. It is *not* grace of attitude. It is *not* richness of voice. It is *not* the glance of excitement from a blazing eye. It is not even fullness of matter. It is not one, nor all of these combined, which gives potency and efficiency to the preached Word. Let men of God take hold of the stupendous realities of the plain Gospel—let them deal with their fellow-men as with candidates for eternity—and whether they read their discourses or declaim them, their efforts will not be "in vain in the Lord." Give them the ineffable anointing of the Spirit, together with an honest love for immortal souls, and they will at once be placed in that proper sympathy with the truth they utter, and with the persons to whom they utter it, which will assure them of a hearing full of attention, and most promising in assurances of profit. "After all," says Secker, "every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, another after that; let each cultivate his own, and no one censure or despise the other." This is true, but it would have been more true had Secker added, that it mattered little what a

man's style of utterance might be, provided he only spake, in earnest, the faithful words of an earnest Saviour, in a manner not offensive to the ear nor repugnant to the common taste.

Our article is already too long. We had intended to say much more. We had specially desired to direct the reader to consider the fact, that the most important Churches in the land are under the ministry of "readers" in the pulpit—that these readers have always been among the most useful and honored of God's servants—and that converts have multiplied where *they* have dealt out the Word, to a degree not often exampled in the history of "extempore" preaching.

But we forbear. Every minister must consult his own capabilities, and must suit the character of his public performances to his own peculiarities of mind and temperament, being careful only to be always "in earnest." For our own part, we fully and freely endorse the sentiments contained in the following pleasing piece of poetry:

> "Your sermons write
> From end to end; and every thought invest
> With full expression, such as best may suit
> Its nature and its use; and then pronounce
> As much as your remembrance can retain.
> Rather read every sentence, word for word,
> Than wander in a desultory strain—
> A chaos, dark, irregular, and wild—
> Where the same thought and language oft revolve
> And re-revolve, to tire sagacious minds.
> But never to your notes be so enslaved
> As to suppress some instantaneous thought
> That may like lightning dart upon the soul,
> And blaze in strength and majesty divine."

God takes men as they are, and pours His grace into the "earthen vessels" of their minds—bids them cultivate holiness—commands them to be studious—makes it their duty to make the most of their native powers—and then

carries them, in His providence, to the pulpit, and promises them an unction from the Holy One to give success to those efforts of their preaching which may be the best that *they* can make. This is our judgment, in one sentence.

ARTICLE V.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861.

We still acknowledge ourselves to be, in one sense, members of the body which is called the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. This title is now, indeed, *a misnomer*, for the United States of America have ceased to be United, and have become two distinct, separate, and, alas! hostile governments. The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, of course, in fact, no longer one Church, but two. And yet the separation will not, we suppose, be formally made until the regular fall sessions of our Presbyteries and Synods. Our readers will, no doubt, acquiesce in our decision to occupy some few pages with our usual Annual Review of the proceedings of the General Assembly—or, rather, of such of its proceedings as will be of any interest to Southern Presbyterians.

I. ORGANIZATION.

After the opening sermon, by the respected Moderator of the last Assembly, Rev. Dr. YEOMANS, from John xviii : 36—"My kingdom is not of this world"—the Assembly was organized, and the Rev. Dr. J. C. BACKUS, of the Presbytery of Baltimore, was elected Moderator, and Rev. D. J. WALLER, of the Presbytery of Northumberland, Temporary Clerk. There were present two hundred and sixty Commissioners, against three hundred and twenty-

nine at the preceding Assembly. From the Synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Arkansas, there were no Commissioners present. From the Synod of Virginia there were two; from that of Nashville, three; from Mississippi, seven; from Memphis, two; from Texas, two—in all, sixteen Commissioners from Synods in the Confederate States, against ninety Commissioners from those Synods in the last Assembly.

This general absence of Southern Commissioners seems to have been misapprehended by the Assembly. Dr. Hodge said "one-third of the Commissioners were absent through the force of circumstances they could not control." Also, in his paper offered as a substitute for Dr. Spring's, he says: "Owing to providential hindrances, nearly one-third of our Presbyteries are not represented;" and he refers to the absent Commissioners as such, "most of them, we believe, by no fault of their own." Evidently, the Assembly in general ascribed this absence to a fear of the consequences which might overtake the Commissioners at their homes, and not to the patriotic feelings, either of our Presbyteries or of the Commissioners themselves. Thus, the people of the North will, on all occasions, it seems, lay the flattering unction to their souls that the South is divided into friends and foes of the so-called United States Government. Let the North sleep on. Time will put an end to their delusion and their dreams. It must be some mighty interest, however, which does so blind them to the real nature of this contest. It must be their not being willing to be convinced, which makes it so hard to convince them that we are both united and in earnest. It would seem as though, did they once appeal to their own hearts, they would find out how the South really feels, and why the Southern Commissioners generally would not go and sit down in council with the enemies of their country seeking her utter ruin and overthrow.

But what did our sixteen Commissioners present mean by the course which they pursued? On this point, as on others, we fear some of them very much misrepresented the South; unless, indeed, they have themselves been misrepresented in the newspapers, from which we have derived our accounts of the Assembly. Dr. WILLIS LORD, of Chicago, urging the adoption of Dr. Spring's resolutions, "honored these brethren for coming to this Assembly, and only wished that all the Commissioners from the South had been here. . . . . But why are they not here? He had a letter from a distinguished source in the South, in which he was informed that some of the Presbyteries would not appoint Commissioners—and why? Because of the difficulty of travel? No; but because of their sympathies with the rebellion."

"Mr. McInnis (of New Orleans) and Mr. Baker (of Texas) besought Dr. Lord not to make the impression that such was the general state of things. That letter was a misrepresentation of the Southern Presbyteries, if true of any; and one of the gentlemen (the reporter could not see which one spoke) deprecated the harshness of the term 'rebellion.'"

We will not trust ourselves to make any comments upon the conduct of these brethren, as thus described by *The Presbyterian.* We hope that *The Presbyterian's* reporter did them injustice.

II. PLACE OF NEXT MEETING.

Several places were put in nomination—amongst them Springfield, Illinois; Washington, D. C.; and Columbus, Ohio. The first named was soon dropped, the nomination, of course, having been only a compliment to Mr. Lincoln, as the Presbyterian interest is but small in that place. But it was seriously and urgently endeavored, by many in the Assembly, to choose Washington City, and no other place but that odious seat of a despotism abhorred by one-third

part of the Church, for the next place of meeting. At last, however, Columbus was victorious. The final vote stood, one hundred and seven for Washington, and one hundred and thirty for Columbus.

III. THE BOARDS.

Upon the subject of two of these institutions there was protracted and earnest discussion, viz: the Board of Publication and the Board of Domestic Missions.

Respecting the former, the Secretary, Rev. Dr. Schenck, made, on the whole, an encouraging statement, notwithstanding the difficulties of the times.

The Board's publications were received every where with growing favor. *The Sabbath School Visitor's* circulation had increased. The number of Colporteurs was greater, by forty, than ever. And the number of Churches contributing to this Board was larger than ever before, by more than one hundred.

Dr. EDWARDS, of Philadelphia, objected to the resolution which endorsed the Board's economy and efficiency. We are not sufficiently informed in regard to the business of the Board, and can not find out what is its capital, its assets, its net profits, nor its expenses. The Board tell us of their *benevolent* operations, but not of their business transactions. He objected to the cost of management. He alleged that $41,000 worth of business had cost $3,000 for Secretaries only, besides a Treasurer at $1,000, and a book-keeper at nearly as much more. He acknowledged the improvement made in *The Sabbath School Visitor*, but he characterized *The Home and Foreign Record* as an eminently dull and stupid paper, sent every where, to the number of fifteen thousand, but never read, and only lumbering up ministers' studies and the reading-rooms of theological seminaries. All that was worth reading in it was soon copied into the papers, and it were better given up, and the cost saved. He charged that the Board gave all their printing to one publishing house, whereas, competition would cheapen work. And, finally, he complained that the Board was too intimate with *The Presbyterian* newspaper. Too many men belonging to that one establishment were in positions of influence in the Board.

Dr. SCHENCK repudiated any wish or intention, on the part of the Board, to practice any concealment. The minutes of the Board and Executive Committee, the vouchers, the accounts, all are here, and a balance-sheet has always been presented to the Assembly. The Board think it would be inexpedient to spread these statements over the whole land; but if the Assembly so direct, it shall be done, notwith-

standing it would place the Board at a business disadvantage, as in competition with our houses in the same trade.

As to the charge of extravagance in the colportage department—to get the forty thousand required much work. It was not a compact capital, all in a lump, and ready to be used, but the *collection*, as well as the *disbursement*, of it demanded labor and expense. A Superintendent of Colportage was necessary, and also a Corresponding Secretary, and the two offices could not be united in one man. A bookkeeper was, also, indispensable, and his pay moderate. And, then, as the Treasurer had to give bonds, it was necessary to pay him, also, a salary.

A MEMBER asked what was the amount of capital of this Board?

Dr. SCHENCK replied that the papers, balance-sheet, and all the details were here, on the table, and could be read or examined at pleasure. He could not, without referring to them, state with accuracy. He then denied, explicitly, the charge of the Board's being tied to one printing establishment. The printing was given out by contract, and to those who would do the best job. As to the charge of intimacy with *The Presbyterian*, it was an extraordinary charge, and he knew not how to meet it. When the Board was established, that paper was here, and had always been the friend of the Board. The intimacy complained of was very natural and proper and profitable. It was, however, only official, and he had never known that any advantage to themselves was sought or obtained from it by those gentlemen, and he was sure no such thing had occurred.

Dr. MUSGRAVE claimed it as his right to demand, for the information of the Assembly, what the capital of this Board was. Without this, no man could judge intelligently of the economy practiced. He was surprised that the Secretary had not promptly answered the questions asked on this point. He could conceive of the propriety of their withholding many details, but not the amount of their capital. The General Assembly had authorized them to add six per cent. annually to the capital. He wanted to know how much the increase now amounted to. When he was Secretary, he estimated their net profits at $10,000 annually. He supposed their capital might soon be a quarter of a million. He thought it was not safe for so few men to control so large a capital.

As to the economy exhibited by the Board, Dr. Musgrave remarked that the entire sales of the Board, for the last year, were about ninety-one thousand dollars, and the expenses of conducting this business about seventeen thousand dollars—more than nineteen per cent.—and that exclusive of rent, which was worth four or five thousand dollars more. He trusted his remarks would not be considered personal. Alas! that it should be so. But has it come to this, that a man may not call in question the propriety of any action of any of our Boards, without having his motives suspected, and being considered personal? He then proceeded to object to the salary of the Corresponding Secretary ($2,500), as being too high; to the Treasurer's office, as a mere

sinecure; to the price paid for the printing, as higher than other printing establishments would ask; and to the undue connection between *The Presbyterian* and the Board. It was a nice little family affair. Two editors of that paper, the brother of one of them recently removed by death, and a brother-in-law, also, all were in the Committee. Why should such a nice little family circle object to any bills that might be handed in for printing at the office of *The Presbyterian?* He would advise those gentlemen to retire from the Board and the Committee, that confidence might be restored to its management. He doubted not that some fifteen cents a token could be saved in the printing. Another subject he would just hint at. If men do not agree with that paper's views of ecclesiastical management, their opinions are misrepresented, their motives are assailed, and they are held up as hostile to the Boards of the Church. No man could have fair play who dissented from the positions of *The Presbyterian.*

Dr. LEYBURN, (Stated Clerk, and editor of *The Presbyterian*, here interposed, although not entitled to the floor,) Moderator, such assaults ought not to be made upon an officer of this Assembly, without an opportunity to defend himself.

Dr. MUSGRAVE called the Clerk to order. He proceeded to the subject of colportage. Would any other publishing house give salaries to agents to sell books, and allow a per centage, too? It was argued that these men were missionaries, but he doubted whether, as a general thing, they did any thing but sell books. It was folly to employ book agents on such principles. Human nature is human nature. The Board should conduct their business on the business principles usually recognized amongst business men.

Mr. T. C. HENRY (Ruling Elder) moved to refer this matter to the Committee, and that Dr. Musgrave and Dr. Edwards be directed to appear before that Committee and substantiate these charges. It was easy to bring indefinite charges.

Dr. EDWARDS was surprised at Mr. Henry's motion. A member rises in his place and asks for explanation, and up gets another member and moves that the inquirer be required to go before a Committee and substantiate charges!

Dr. MCPHAIL (Chairman of the Committee on the Publication Board's Report) said the work proposed in the motion to recommit would require eight or ten days to perform it. Such an investigation could not be had in less time. Besides, is this the business of a Standing Committee? If so, is not the Board itself a farce? In regard to the charge that the Board is a family affair, he saw no justice in it.

Dr. SCHENCK, being again allowed the floor, said he regretted to be called upon to meet the venerable father who had made this assault. An assault of the Secretary of one Board upon another Board, he hardly knew how to meet. From one who had been for one year a Secretary of this very Board; who had often made earnest appeals for it, from the pulpit and with the pen; and who, in one of his own an-

nual reports, written as Secretary, had contradicted the very statements which he had himself made here to-day—from such an one he was surprised to hear what had now been uttered.

The history of the capital stock was as follows: It was first gathered by collections which the Assembly had ordered, during the period from 1839 to 1842, and thus rose to about $43,000. It was ordered then by the Assembly that the profits, at the rate of six per cent., be added to the capital. It now amounts to about $242,000. As for the house in Chestnut street, it is now worth no such sum to us as $75,000. The house cost $37,000. It gives us shelter for our business. He denied that books of the Board cost more than those of other publishers, and he presented various specimens to prove what he said. He insisted that the per centage of expenses in the Board was only 12¾ per cent. instead of 19 per cent. He compared the per centage of his Board with that of other like establishments, which were in one case 27 per cent., and in another case 28 per cent.; upon salaries alone the per centage in one of them was 10⅝, and another 14, while in the Board of Publication it was only 11 per cent. In regard to that nice little family circle, it is indeed a nice and orderly circle. True, that venerable father can not, perhaps, appreciate the family circle as well as if he sustained certain relations in life; but more is the pity. If he was more familiar with such family scenes he would, perhaps, not envy us our great enjoyment. But he is mistaken in supposing that there are in that family circle any collusions to the injury of this Board. Dr Engles and Dr. Leyburn are as often on opposite sides as any other members, and if Dr. Musgrave would insinuate that private ends are subserved by our counsels, the imputation is unworthy.

This debate, so little creditable to the Presbyterians of the North and North-West, occurred on the fifth day of the Assembly. On the sixth day, the Report of the Committee on the Board of Domestic Missions came before the body. The chief item was the Committee's recommendation that the office of Coördinate Secretary be discontinued, and that in filling the office of the one Secretary, both the present incumbents be passed by, and some new man appointed.

There was a minority report, proposing to employ one Secretary only, but leaving the Board free to choose whom they would.

Dr. KENNEDY, for the minority, urged that the Assembly had given to the Board the power of filling these offices, and could not take it back, without violating the compact it had made with the

Board. This Board was composed of the best men in the Presbyterian Church. To resume the powers once delegated, seems a bold and a far stretch of power on the part of the Assembly. The members of the Board, if they had any self-respect, would no longer serve in a Board whose powers were thus trifled with.

The proposal to remove both Secretaries really had reference to but one. The Senior Secretary had resigned—the Junior only was to be the victim. And who was this Junior Secretary? A man who has been serving for seventeen years, and never accepted a cent of his salary whilst a single missionary was lacking his—a man who has given his time, his toil, his property, to this Church and this Board.

Dr. DONALDSON, for the majority, urged that the Assembly had never created these offices, and had as much right to abolish a Secretary as a Secretaryship. It was a mistake, that one man only was affected; for, although the Senior Secretary had proposed to resign, his resignation had not yet been accepted. But neither of the two could secure the coöperation of the whole Church, and he would not sacrifice the great interests of this Board to the official claims of any one or two men.

THE MODERATOR then observed that it was usual to hear the Secretaries of the Board after receiving the report of the Committee. The Senior Secretary, Dr MUSGRAVE, then came forward and expressed embarrassment, after having on another subject occupied so much time. His brother (Dr. Schenck) had applied rather a venerable title to him—"venerable father"—and seemed to think him disqualified for appreciating the amenities of social life. The charge fell with a bad grace from one who had continued so long a *widower*, whilst the speaker was only a *bachelor;* still, he thought neither of them disqualified thereby for their duties to their respective Boards. He had been himself a friend to all these Boards—not of that youthful class of friends who did not know Joseph. He was an old soldier in the service. An effort had been made to institute, by *inuendo*, a comparison between him and another officer. But he would publicly ask the other Secretary if he had not received his salary up to the 1st March, and whether there was not due to the missionaries unpaid salaries to the amount of seven thousand five hundred dollars? He proceeded to charge the present embarrassments of the Board for money on their rash and undue expansion the preceding year. It was not due to the political difficulties and pecuniary crisis, for this Board was insolvent in August last; whereas, the election that produced the crisis did not take place till November. For this rash expansion he was not responsible. He warred against it. He had always favored a large working balance, so as to be prepared for such evils and revulsions as have now occurred. He then recounted the history of the abolition of the Associate Secretary's office (Dr. Happersett's), with which he declared he had nothing to do, and then the reëlection of Dr. Happersett, with himself, as two Coördinate Secretaries, which had caused him to tender his own resignation, though he

afterwards withdrew it, and also that decapitation of the heads of old and tried members of the Board, and the other particulars of *the revolution in the Board*, which had resulted in the establishment of the more liberal policy, with all its consequent present embarrassments. Three years ago he thought the then expenses (nine thousand dollars) too much, now they are fourteen thousand. The aggregate for salaries of Secretaries and Superintendents alone (including those at Louisville) are now nine thousand four hundred dollars. He urged that one Secretary was sufficient, for the Clerk had kept count of the letters each Secretary wrote, and he had himself, in 1859, written one hundred and nine more than his colleague. And how many do you suppose we each write in one day, leaving out Sabbaths? How many a day do you suppose?—a little less than ONE! Only one thing more would he revert to, and that by the order of his Presbytery. It was to the proscription in the membership of the Board of all who had voted to abolish the office of Associate Secretary. Almost every such man has been guillotined as his term of office expired—dropped from this Board and this Committee. Must matters in the Church be managed as they sometimes are in the State? If this thing goes on, your Boards will become corrupt.

Dr. HAPPERSETT (the Junior Secretary) would not speak two and a half hours. He had an instinctive horror of controversy—would rather suffer persecution. He complained that the Committee was composed of five out of seven who had prejudged the case, yet he knew the Moderator had no blame in the matter. He said a previous General Assembly itself had expressly ordained the establishment of the two Coördinate Secretaryships, and so they were not the creation of the Board. He met the statement that the Board was insolvent by referring to the balance then in the Treasury of three thousand dollars. He utterly denied that his own salary had been paid when the missionaries were lying out of their money. He had given his own note into bank, and had the missionaries all paid, before setting out for Louisville on the business of the Board, previous to the 4th of March. But he alleged that the Treasurer had been ordered by the other Secretary to pay no more missionaries until money enough had accumulated to pay his (Dr. Musgrave's) salary, which was paid on the 25th, five days before it was due. He himself had not received any of his salary this year. He detailed certain statements, showing that the more liberal policy of the Board had worked well. He explained why the Assembly at Indianapolis changed the *personnel* of the Board. It was because of a falling off that year both in missionaries and funds, and that was a year of great general prosperity. The missionaries were stinted in their salary while yet there was a balance lying in the Treasury of twenty-four thousand dollars. Was it any wonder that the Assembly should revolutionize the Board? He reviewed the history of the Associate Secretaryship and its abolition, and then the reaction which ensued, and he replied to the charges of proscription. As to the Senior Secretary's one letter a day, the fact is, that the Clerk

wrote the most of them, as the book itself shows, where they are signed G. W. Musgrave, per W. DeArmand, Clerk. But you will not be surprised that he wrote no more letters, when I tell you that I have kept a little book with a record of the precise time the gentleman has been in the office during the year. The average is but *fifty-five minutes a day*. These things I never would have mentioned, but for the extraordinary attacks upon myself. Dr. Happersett concluded by averring that he had simply defended himself, and that most reluctantly, against unfounded charges. He was now ready to retire, and to serve God in some other department, wherever Providence might call him.

After this discussion between the two Secretaries, a few of the other members of the Assembly expressed their views, chiefly to the effect that the harmony of the Church required that both these Secretaries be passed over. The previous question was called for, and the majority report adopted, which instructed the Board, in view, most especially, of the "severe pecuniary pressure of the times," to elect but one Secretary, and he a new man.

On the next day, the seventh, the discussion on the Board of Publication was resumed, and Mr. Waller argued that the cost of managing the business was disproportionate to the amount of the business done. In the department of colportage alone, there was expended the sum of thirteen thousand dollars, in managing a business of twenty-eight thousand.

The discussion was interrupted at this point, and down to the night of the tenth day it was not resumed. Beyond the night session of that day, we have no particular accounts of the proceedings which refer at all to this matter.

Our readers are aware that we are not of those who have approved the principle of the Church's delegating her work to these Boards. We will not, however, charge the disgrace of the recent discussion, with its disageeable and unbecoming personalities, to the principle or to the system of Boards. Were the system in the hands of *gentlemen* all round—that is, of none but refined, and fair and honorable men—such shameful results might never be brought

forth. But every Presbyterian Minister or Elder is not a refined and honorable man; and one coarse, selfish, imperious Secretary can run even a good piece of machinery into the ground. We are more than ever satisfied, however, from this very debate, that the machinery itself is liable to great objections, and must, in the long run, work evil to the Church, even in the best of hands. Look, for example, at what has now, we believe, for the first time, come to the knowledge of the Church generally, that the Board of Publication has a capital which, in twenty years, has grown from forty-three thousand to very nearly one-quarter of a million of dollars, and which is constantly increasing at the rate of six per cent. per annum. And recall the fact, which was alleged, and not contradicted, that, a good many years ago, the net annual profits of this Board were ten thousand dollars! Well might Dr. Musgrave say, (although it was, for him, of all men, a most inconsistent declaration,) that it was not safe for a few men to control so mighty an agency. And the remarkable part of the case is, that it has been generally supposed that the Board of Publication was an institution struggling hard to keep its head above the water. A few shrewd men have insisted that they ought to be able to make money out of the vast patronage which, as a publishing house, they get from the great Presbyterian Church, instead of needing collections all the time for their Colporteurs, etc. But still, the general impression has been that the institution needed help, or it could not stand.

Now human nature, even in the best of men, being what it is, who will deny that it is a dangerous thing to lodge so much influence with one of these organizations, outside of the regular Church courts? Does not the struggle for power in the other Board, which was so clearly brought to light in the late debate—does not that struggle show how much of chicanery and management may be covered up in

one of these societies which our Presbyterian Church has had fastened to her free-born limbs?

Or, look at the report, this year, of the Domestic Missionary Board. It has had seven hundred and seven Missionaries in commission. And all these Missionaries are beholden to Dr. Happersett for his kindness in putting his note into bank that they may get their salaries paid. Is this not a large body of Presbyterian Ministers to be dependent upon the kindness of one man, or even two men? This whole difficulty, which so disgraced the late Assembly's proceedings, has arisen out of an effort by the Church to obviate to herself the objection which she felt to suffering so large a one-man power as this. And now the Assembly, finding that the two men could not agree, has gone back to the former plan of intrusting it all to one individual. The difficulty is inherent. All these Boards are great centres of power. If we must have them, let us submit to the evils which they necessarily bring with them. But if Domestic Missions can be as well or better carried on directly by the Presbyteries, let us operate in that way.

The objections hitherto made to the system of the Boards have, for the most part, always come from a portion of the Southern Commissioners. But never did any part of the South urge any such assault as has been witnessed this year. Our objections have been to the principles, not to the men. It has not been the South that has ever arraigned the Boards before the Assembly upon charges of incompetency, maladministration, or unfaithfulness—such charges have always come from the North, and have also most signally marked and disgraced the very year which witnessed the gathering of an almost exclusively Northern Assembly. Even the charge of an extravagant *per-centage* of administrative expense is not a charge which we of the South have urged—that, also, is a Northern censure. We have always been aware that great enterprises must, in the nature of things, require great expenditures of money. Competent

salaries to competent officers the South has not objected to, nor to any amount of necessary outlay, if we could only get the great work efficiently done. We have had no sympathy with the trick of adding together several salaries of officers, or other like items of necessary expense, and holding up the sum they make to frighten the Church from a steadfast pursuit of her great ends. But, on the other hand, we have equally detested the narrow spirit which delighted to figure up the comparatively insignificant doings of the Church in any one of these great departments, and because the sum they constitute would be a large amount for one man to give away, or even to possess, therefore to represent it as a large sum for the whole Church to contribute. We have ever maintained that our Church operations of all kinds were really on a very inadequate scale, and that there was nothing done worthy of the annual huzzas which Red Tape had moved the Assembly to utter. Yet we always granted that, considering the kind of expedients adopted to draw out the Church's resources, what was done was as much as could, perhaps, be expected; and that, no doubt, the men appointed by the Church to employ these human expedients were as faithful and as successful as could any where be found. The argument of the Southern Commissioners, so far as concerns the point of efficiency, has always been to this effect: Take away all your inventions of men—your Yankee notions in Church machinery—your rags and tatters of Congregationalism, and give us the natural and simple operation of the ordinances of Christ. Let your Churches be taught the doctrine of the grace of giving by her pastors; and let your Church courts directly oversee the various parts of Christ's work committed to them. Then, by the blessing of her Head, you will see what the Church is both able and willing to do and to give.

It has, indeed, been, for the most part, Southern Commissioners who have gone beyond these views of the dan-

gerousness and the inefficiency of the system, and attacked the very principle of the Boards, as an unwarranted, and unpresbyterian, and unscriptural scheme. But the opponents of the scheme have ever been in the minority. Year after year, when the matter has been discussed, the Boards have been sustained by large majorities. The system has, therefore, been long and fairly tried. It has enjoyed the confidence and support of the large body of our Church for a great length of time. Now, at last, it happens to it to encounter internecine strife and contention. It begins to devour itself. It is one Board, or rather the Secretary of one Board, that leads the attack on another. It is the two Secretaries of another Board that assail each other. It is no other than our old friend, Dr. Musgrave, who now sounds the alarm about too much power in the hands of a few men—it is he that complains that a man may not call in question the policy of one of these institutions, without having his motives impugned—it is he that can not get fair play from *The Presbyterian*—and it is he, on the other hand, who is now accused of making indefinite charges against a Board. Thus does Providence appear to be against the Boards, and the Church is plagued until she will relinquish the use of this Altar of Damascus.

We have dwelt upon this subject at some length, because, of course, the question will come before the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States, now to be organized, in due time, whether she will employ such outside institutions, or stand simply on the platform of Presbyterianism and the Bible. Will she delegate her powers to any such Societies, or will she do her own work through committees, directly responsible to her? Will she undertake to do the Ministerial Education work, or the Domestic Missionary work, of every particular settled Presbytery, through any agency of the General Assembly, or will she devolve both these works immediately upon the several Presbyteries themselves? Would she think it desirable, if it could possibly

be done, to transport Philadelphia southward? Or, this being, alas! impossible, will she try and make a copy—*a fac-simile*—as near as possible, of the comely original? Can she hope and expect to live and grow and thrive without the help of any such ecclesiastical metropolis, any such centre of Church power, and parties, and squabbles?

DR. SPRING'S RESOLUTIONS.

At first Dr. Spring's was but one resolution, to the effect that a committee be appointed to inquire whether it was wise and expedient for the Assembly to make any expression of attachment to the American Union, and to the Constitution and Government; and, if so, what expression should be given. This business came up on the third day of the meeting. It was discussed from time to time, and decided on the twelfth day.

When first proposed, Dr. Spring's resolution was laid on the table, upon the motion of Rev. Mr. Hoyte, of Nashville, Tennessee, by a vote of one hundred and twenty-two to one hundred and two. Dr. Spring called for the ayes and noes; but some maintained, rather strangely, that they could not be had if demanded, after a vote was actually taken. Then it was moved to take up the motion just laid on the table; but it was then rather strangely insisted, and that by Dr. Hodge, that to lay on the table was a final disposition of any subject. The rules generally followed clearly provide that it may be taken up whenever two-thirds of those present at the time consent. Even when indefinitely postponed, a subject may be called back again before the house, by consent of three-fourths of the members present at the time. But in either case, the motion to reconsider must be made and seconded by persons of the majority. This point caused a good deal of discussion, and the appeal was made to the generosity of some two of the majority, to move the reconsideration, but there was no response. It would thus seem that at that time a

majority of the body were for silence in the premises. It will be interesting to trace the causes and progress of the change wrought in their views.

The subject did not come up again until the sixth day. Dr. Spring then said: "The influence of the action of last week upon both the friends of revolt throughout the country, and the friends of the Government, was of the most unhappy kind, as he was well informed by advices received both from the North and the West." What the effects of the Assembly's action was in the North and the West, of course we can not judge. But as to the South, which is the seat of the "revolt," and where the greater part of "the friends of revolt throughout the country" are to be found, it is very certain that it has had no appreciable effect whatsoever. Dr. Spring shows old age. Last year, we remember that he deplored the discussion in the Assembly about Boards, for it endangered the Union, of which these were so many bonds! This year, he fancies that an accomplished revolution would go backwards or forwards, according as the Assembly should judge respecting its merits! In view, therefore, of the unhappy effects of what the Assembly had done, Dr. Spring offered for adoption the following preamble and resolutions:

Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God toward this favored land, and also recognizing our obligations to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, the fourth day of July next be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that on this day ministers and people are called on humbly to confess and bewail our national sins; to offer our thanks to the Father of Lights for His abundant and undeserved goodness towards us as a nation; to seek His guidance and blessing upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as the then assembled Congress of the United States; and to implore Him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Christian profession, to turn away His anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honorable peace.

Resolved, 2. That in the judgment of this Assembly, it is the duty of ministers and churches under its care to do all in their power to

promote and perpetuate the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government.

Afterwards, the fourth day of July was substituted by the first, and the second resolution was altered by Dr. Spring himself, with others, so as to read thus:

Resolved, 2. That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, as far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution, and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty. And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declares that by the term "Federal Government," as here used, is not meant any particular Administration, or the peculiar opinions of any political party, but that central Administration, which, being at any time appointed and inaugurated according to the terms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence.

There was some promiscuous conversation now had, and several motions were made, none of which appeared to be seconded. Dr. Hodge then moved that this subject be made the first order of the day for Friday morning, the eighth day of the Assembly.

On Friday the discussion was opened by Dr. THOMAS, of the Presbytery of Miami. He urged the right of free discussion against those who wished to shut his mouth. And he advocated the right of the Assembly to testify on behalf of the civil authority, when it was in extreme danger. The old Synod of New York and Philadelphia, then the supreme judicature of the Church, repeatedly did this during the old French war, and the pre-revolutionary difficulties, and also after Independence was declared. And the Synod of South Carolina had recently taken the initiative in the matter, and were committed thoroughly to the position that the Church ought in such cases to speak. If the Presbyterian Church *dare* to shrink from her duty in this crisis, she will be blown away like the foam from the crest of the billow by the tornado. Shall we *dare* to falter when our army and our Government need our encouragement? Are we Secessionists? Are we traitors? Have we forgotten our loyalty? Then, what right have we to sit here as a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of these United States?

Rev. Mr. GILLESPIE, of Tennessee, contended that the Church courts were not the proper place to express loyalty. He loved loyalty to government, and would express it at the proper place—at the ballot-box, or in the battle-field, but not in the Church court nor the pulpit. He would give his life to restore the country and the Union to what it was, but even for this he would not divide the Church.

Dr. HODGE differed not with brother Thomas in regard to the duty of the Church to testify on proper occasions. But he objected to the resolutions on other grounds.

1st. Because this action is unnecessary. Our people do not need to be roused. We can not, indeed, hold them back. So sublime, grand, wide-spread and irrepressible a rising was never heard of before. Who doubts the loyalty of Presbyterians?

2d. Such a pronouncement will be highly injurious to the Union, and the objects of the Federal Government. The Administration does not ask our interference—does not need it. It will do them harm, instead of good. A distinguished member of the Cabinet has said he wished the General Assembly would aim to preserve the unity of the Church, as a means of preserving the union of the country.

Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, here interposed, to state that the other members of the Cabinet had been telegraphed, to know if they desired the Assembly to take no action, and here is the answer, assuring us that they wish us to do nothing.

Dr. HODGE, resuming, urged that these resolutions tend to sever, rather than preserve, the Union. The best service we can render to Government is, to preserve the kind feeling of the Union-loving men of the South, so that when the time comes for them to assert their loyalty, they will be encouraged to do it. Our Church is the last link that holds this Union together.

A third objection to this paper is, that the Assembly is designed to represent the whole country. Had the Assembly met this year in a Southern city, and been composed chiefly of Southern men, would it have seemed to you fair and honorable for them to vote similar resolutions in favor of their Confederacy?

4th. The great consideration is. we are bound by our ordination vows to study the *unity of the Presbyterian Church.* What right have we to take a course that will drive away from us one-third of the General Assembly, and one-third of our Churches? The Church is the most influential and conservative agency for the preservation of our Union. He closed by begging not to be misunderstood—he was not pleading against the Government—but he was pleading for the preservation of the Church. He then moved the adoption of the following paper, as a substitute for Dr. Spring's:

"The unhappy contest in which the country is now involved has brought both the Church and the State face to face with questions of patriotism and of morals, which are without a parallel in this or any other land. True to their hereditary principles, the Ministers and Elders present in the Assembly have met the emergency by the most

decisive proof, in their respective social and civil relations, of their firm devotion to the Constitution and laws under which we live; and they are ready at all suitable times, and at whatever personal sacrifice, to testify their loyalty to that Constitution under which 'this goodly vine has sent out her boughs into the sea, and her branches into the river.'

"For the following reasons, the Assembly deem it impossible to put forth, at the present time, a more extended and emphatic deliverance upon the subject, to wit;

"1. The General Assembly is neither a Northern nor a Southern body; it comprehends the entire Presbyterian Church, irrespective of geopraphical lines or political opinions, and had it met this year, as it does with marked uniformity one-half of the time, in some Southern city, no one, he believed, would have presumed to ask of it a fuller declaration of its views upon this subject, than it has embodied in this minute.

"2. Owing to providential hindrances, nearly one-third of our Presbyteries are not represented at our present meeting; they feel that not only Christian courtesy, but common justice, requires that we should refrain, except in the presence of some stringent necessity, from adopting measures to bind the consciences of our brethren who are absent, most of them, we believe, by no fault of their own.

"3. Such has been the course of events, that all the other evangelical denominations have been rent asunder. We alone retain, this day, the proportions of a national Church. We are, happily, united among ourselves in all questions of doctrine and discipline. The dismemberment of our Church, while fraught with disaster to all our spiritual interests, could not fail to envenom the political animosities of the country, and to augment the sorrows which already oppress us. We are not willing to sever this last bond which holds the North and South together in the fellowship of the Gospel. Should an all-wise Providence hereafter exact this sacrifice, we shall be resigned to it. But for the present, both religion and patriotism require us to cherish a Union which, by God's blessing, may be the means of reuniting our land."

Dr. ANDERSON, of California, said there was danger of other losses than of the South. There are threats of disunion of the Church from the West, which have come since last week. You have to choose where the Unity is to be preserved. He replied to the argument that this action is unnecessary. The subject is before us, and it must be met. Many had kindred in arms—he himself had many dear friends—he wanted to encourage them. It was useless to try and drown the Assembly with such milk-and-water sophistry as that of the substitute. It was entirely too weak—one gallon of milk to about five barrels of water. (Great laughter, and applause in the galleries.) He heard much talk about the Unity of the Church—it was like tying two Mississippi steamboats together with a piece of silk thread, and bidding them not break apart when starting in different

directions. How long would the Church remain one, if we have two confederacies? Not a moment, although Dr. Hodge endeavored to make us believe the contrary, in the last number of the *Princeton Review*.

Dr. SPRING said the paper he had presented was not in the course he had originally proposed. It might have led to some such document as the substitute now offered. But it had been treated with discourtesy, and unceremoniously laid on the table. He believed the measure now proposed by him was right. Talk about the Unity of the Church! It is broken. Like the *debris* of the rock, it is crumbling, and no timid measures could prevent it. The only present hope of unity was on this side of the line. As for the voice from Washington, he would like to know by what measures it had been *procured*—he would like to see it, and find out what more it contained than had been quoted here. And for whom is your sympathy now evoked? For REBELS. Pass Dr. Hodge's substitue, and he would not like to say how many of the Synod of New York would again meet with the General Assembly. He wanted his last utterance to be for that glorious Union, for which his father had fought, and for which he had never ceased, and never should cease, while alive, to labor and to pray.

Judge RYERSON, of New Jersey, proceeded to recite the evidence, which convinced him that it had long been the design of South Carolina to break up this Union. He did not consider the usurpation of the South entitled to any respect. It had none of the claims of a Government. It was a sheer conspiracy, and a wanton and inexcusable rebellion. Was it possible to preserve the unity of the Church after the nation is rent in fragments? Is it supposed that we will consent to attend the General Assembly, when we can travel to it only under a system of passports? It was folly to think of it. Americans would never submit to it.

Mr. GILLESPIE, interposing, asked if China, India, and Africa were not now represented on our floor, and what was to hinder the South from coming in as they?

Judge RYERSON. The only way to keep the Church one, is to keep the country one. We have the constitutional right to make the deliverance proposed in Dr. Spring's paper—let us not be afraid to do it.

The Rev. Mr. HASTINGS spoke of the sudden birth of an intense spirit of patriotism, and of the danger of resisting that giant. He spoke of a letter he had received at noon, and which he held up in his hand, in which a very prominent citizen expressed astonishment that the Assembly should have laid Dr. Spring's first paper on the table.

Rev. Mr. HOYTE (of Tennessee) urged that the Assembly had no right to make the deliverance proposed. It was unconstitutional, for the Assembly could interfere with such matters only by humble petition, or when invited thereto by the civil authorities. The action proposed would divide us. It was also unfair to take such action in the absence

of so many of the Southern Commissioners. Why should you take advantage of our feebleness amongst you to force us into circumstances of distress and danger? Who asks you to touch this thing? Not the Cabinet—not the officers of your army—not the men who take broadest views of the interests of the nation—not the Union men of the South. The Government at Washington would not thank you for any such deliverance; and, while it can not increase the unanimity which appears to prevail at the North, its effect at the South would be to drive to despair those who had done nothing to bring about this deplorable state of things, and who had done what they could to avert it.

Dr. MUSGRAVE denounced secession as a monstrous immorality. The Assembly ought to say so, and encourage their public men in crushing out at once and for ever this ruinous error. We ought to aid in sweeping it from the country and from the earth. He would do it for our own sakes—he would do it for the encouragement of all loyal hearts in the South. He pointed to Maryland and Baltimore, as now rejoicing in the protection of the General Government, and he hoped that other States would soon receive the same protection. He hoped the paper of Dr. Spring would pass, not only by an overwhelming majority, but by an unanimous vote.

On the next day, the Rev. Dr. Wines, of St. Louis, informed the Assembly that he was in a sense the representative of the Hon. Edward Bates, the distinguished member of the Cabinet referred to yesterday. Whereupon, he read the telegraphic correspondence which had passed between them, and then proceeded to define his own position, and to offer a substitute for both the papers before the house. He was for no action—for it might be that the mission of our Church in this solemn crisis is to assist in the readjustment of our relations to the seceded States.

Rev. Dr. MATHEWS, of Kentucky, said his affections and interests were on both sides—North and South. The State from which he came, he was happy to announce, had unfurled and kept waving the banner of the stars and stripes. (Applause, with a few *cat-calls*, both which the Moderator checked.) Dr. Mathews expressed regret that he had said any thing to elicit such an expression. He had only said so to show that what he had to say he said as a Union man. He went on to deplore the straits into which the proposed action of the Assembly was about to bring the Union men of the South. Two things he wished to add before he sat down. 1st. There are brethren in the South who wished to secede—a minority, he believed—but they want a pretext. O! give them no such pretext. 2d. There are men in the South who labor night and day to heal these divisions. Let those men be cherished and upheld. The last thing he had to say was, let this Assembly legislate in the spirit of great charity. What if there has been wrong at the South? What if on the records of the Synod of South Carolina there are things we regret? Ought we not to exercise charity in judgments? What did the Master say to her

who stood accused before Him? "Go, sin no more: neither do I condemn you."

The Rev. Mr. WALLER urged the adoption of Dr. Spring's paper, because of the very conviction Southern Christian men were said to have, that it was wrong to obey the Government at Washington. For this very reason we ought to pronounce, and do it distinctly. Such a conviction he considered in decided opposition to the Bible and our Confession. It was such a conviction as this that ruined our race, and blighted Paradise. It was an allurement to withdraw her allegiance from the rightful government under which she was placed, that was the temptation of our first mother. It was a withdrawal of their loyalty from their lawful sovereign and His government, that constituted the sin, and produced the ruin, of our first parents. They claimed the right to do it, but had no right. A similar temptation had beset our brethren, and we should warn them of it.

On Monday morning, Mr. Waller still having the floor,

Dr. WINES, by his leave, offered a modification of his paper.

Dr. SPRING presented a modification of his second resolution.

Dr. BERGEN offered a substitute of his own.

Dr. STOCKTON proposed a substitute for Dr. Spring's second resolution.

Judge RYERSON offered a paper, proposing a committee of nine, with Dr. Spring as chairman.

Dr. MCPHAIL offered a substitute for all.

Mr. MILLER (Ruling Elder), of New York, offered sundry preambles and resolutions.

Dr. MONFORT also offered a paper.

Rev. Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, offered a paper.

Rev. Mr. STRYKER presented one.

Rev. Mr. REASER asked if this thing was not becoming ridiculous.

The MODERATOR answered that it was not.

Rev. Mr. MURPHY also offered a paper.

Mr. WALLER confessed bewilderment amongst all these papers. He feared the very delay occasioned was breeding timidity. He feared the disposition to stand still would do mischief. He felt inclined to stick to the boat in which he had first embarked, viz: Dr. Spring's paper. He deprecated a false issue—that we were to save the Church

from division. Territorial division did not necessarily involve spiritual division. Separation in form may exist, and be compatible with spiritual union. He denied that we were making a new term of communion. He quoted the prophet Samuel: "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," which latter crime was punishable with death, and therefore the former was likewise. If we had any doubt about the legitimacy of our Government, or the application of these Scriptures, then we might hesitate. But nobody doubted this, and nothing but an "obfuscation" of interests could admit such a doubt. Moreover, our brethren of the South have not set an example of hesitation and forbearance. He read from the Minutes of the Synod of South Carolina to show this. These resolutions of the Synod of South Carolina, urging secession, were passed before the State had seceded. Here was a Southern Synod urging rebellion against lawful authority in advance, and promising in advance to bless it with the prayers of the Church. Surely, these men can not complain if we lift our voice on the side of God and the country.

Dr. BACKUS, of Schenectady, urged the inexpediency of the proposed action. The administration wished the Church to hold together. On the other hand, the disunionists will hail the proposed action with joy. But it is said other bodies have spoken out, and so should we. If others have acted, impulsively yielding to the tide of the times, let us all the more move cautiously, and with our pristine, far-reaching wisdom and tide-resisting firmness.

Dr. YEOMANS was sorry a judicious committee had not been agreed to, that they might have embodied in a harmonious minute what might command the suffrages of a majority of both sides. He regretted extremely that such an opportunity had been lost by the tabling of Judge Ryerson's resolution. It was a solemn moment in the history of our Church. We stand on the brink of division. And there seems to have been a real preparation of mind for division. We have had an apology for it here this morning. From the beginning, it did seem that there were some who had ends to reach at this terrible sacrifice. Is it not time for us to pause and ponder our way? Moderator, if I could utter one word to delay this dreadful result—if I could make one utterance that might recall my brethren to a sober consideration of the real issue before us, it would be the sweetest word of my life, and one which, to my dying day, it would be most pleasant to remember. It is admitted that a division is likely, if this vote is pressed. Is there any good to be gained by this sad sacrifice? Can we afford the sacrifice? Can this Church's mission be accomplished if she be divided? He urged particularly the advantages the Church must lose for doing good to the slaves of the South.

It is one of the pretexts for this action (he used the word not in an invidious sense) that we are to uphold the Government. Is there a call for this? We have individually, and in various and decided ways, expressed our patriotism. Is it necessary that the same class of men repeat, in every possible relation they fill, their devotion to the

country? We have proof that the Government itself does not want, but rather deprecates, this support from us. We are asked to do over again, as a Church court, what we have already done as citizens. We are doing it at the sacrifice of the integrity of our Church organization. We not only do it, but we *understand* that we do it. But is it wise and right? He deprecated the inevitable consequences, and could see no compensating advantages. We defeat our Church enterprises—we defeat the very purpose of the action itself. We cut the last, strongest, tenderest bond that holds our country together. O! sir, let us hold on to our Southern brethren—they will do good and great service in times and efforts that yet belong to the future. One brother had reminded us that there is a North-West. Why, sir! that is the very thing that ought to be forgotten. Now is the time to ignore sections. O! sir, let us not destroy the conservative position of our Church in regard to the great question that is agitating the civilized world—the question of most difficult solution in our own beloved land. Let us not descend from our vantage ground. Let us not let go the cable that holds us, and us only, in available position for good in relation to that subject. It is small matter to speak of patriotism. It is cheap to do as he did the last Sabbath before he left home, viz: to tell his people that we were engaged in a great struggle, that must be fought through, once for all. He had urged them to do their duty to their country in this, the hour of their peril. This was a cheap utterance for us in the North to make. He appealed to the kind feelings of the body for the Southern members, in view of the sacrifices they had made to come to the Assembly. He hoped naught would be done to increase their difficulty and distress. He earnestly begged that the Southern men who had not spoken might be heard. He had heard of one of them who had stood face to face with the bold front of secession—with a mob of six hundred excited people—pleading for the Union, and who would like to do it here. Another, from the most distant seceded State, would be willing to say a few words. He hoped the house would be willing to hear them, and others, and give them a fair and candid hearing, and would gravely ponder what they had to say.

Dr. Willis Lord, of Chicago, eulogized the Government, to support which it was proposed to pledge ourselves. He spoke of its protection of us and of the Church, and of its beneficent influence on our country and the world. He urged the entire *constitutionality* of the action proposed, viz: the adopting of Dr. Spring's paper. This new doctrine of the unconstitutionality of Church utterances on such subjects, which has been much mooted for a few years, came from the same source from which our other troubles came. Its origin is identical with that of nullification and secession. It is designed to estop the Church from meeting her responsibilities and performing her full mission. He also urged the *expediency* of the course. You might as well give up your Missionary work in the great West if you falter on this subject. His third reason for this action was, its *necessity*. In

no other way can we show that we have been and are loyal. We must pass these resolutions, to meet the sad fact that one Synod had avowed disloyalty already. They had penned such action and sent it to the General Assembly. Some of the Ministers of that Synod were actually in the army of the rebels. His fourth reason was, that the course proposed was *right*. It had been said it was unfair to pass these resolutions in the absence of the Southern brethren. Why unfair? Is it right to presume, in their absence, that they would not approve of a measure so right and expedient in itself? He honored those Southern brethren who had come to the Assembly. He wished all the Southern Commissioners had been present. But why are they not? He had a letter from a distinguished source in the South, in which he was informed that some of the Presbyteries would not appoint Commissioners—and why? Because of the difficulty of travel?—No; but because of their sympathy with the rebellion.

Here (says *The Presbyterian*) Mr. McINNIS and Mr. BAKER besought Dr. Lord not to make the impression that such was the general state of things. That letter was a misrepresentation of the Southern Presbyteries generally, if true of any; and one of the gentlemen (the reporter could not see which) deprecated the *harshness* of the term "rebellion."

Dr. Lord urged that our charter, and the protection of our Church property, was from the Government which we proposed to encourage. We owe it much. We ought to sustain it, for it has done much for us and for our Church. Our dearest interests are at stake, and if this United States Government is prostrated, every thing will be in jeopardy. He loved the Church—Christ's cross and crown were above every thing, but his country next. And, in conclusion, he could not help saying:

> "The star-spangled banner, O! long may it wave,
> O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

Rev. W. M. BAKER, of Texas, said he feared he might say some thing unpleasant to his brethren, whom he shrank from offending. He feared he might not do justice to the cause in which he felt constrained to speak. Born in Washington, raised there, educated in reverence for the Government, he still loved it, and loved the whole country. The present state of things is one of the greatest griefs of his whole life. He was going to speak plainly, and say things which might endanger his life, both at the North and at the South. He was opposed to the proposed deliverance, which was neither a Christian nor a religious movement; for, 1st. It was by a *sudden* impulse of the venerable father who introduced it; 2d. It was military, it smelt of war. You are making a Church utterance under a military impulse. We from the South opposed secession, but were borne before the torrent. Now we find a thundergust raging at the North, and upon its wild and raging bosom is our Church to be borne away? Dr. Lord had shewed a profound ignorance of the South. Grant that you have

to choose between the going off of the North-West and that of the South. If the Church must divide, let it not divide along that accursed, fatal line—Mason's and Dixon's. He was against secession—but what can man do against the tide? When overpowered, what can we do but submit? And was it generous or just for this Assembly to put us in a position where we must either separate from our homes and fields of labor, or from this beloved Church of our fathers? If you pass this resolution, we must either leave our all, give up our charges to destitution, and leave our fields of labor, or separate from you. For, is it not duty to submit to the powers that be? Can we rightfully resist it where there is none other there for us to obey? We are told the popular excitement is such that the Assembly dare not be silent. It is just as impossible to resist the excitement there as here. He was Daniel Baker's son, and was glad that holy man was not alive to witness these troubles. Brethren say the Southern Confederacy is a usurpation. If you pass these resolutions, you compel us to be loyal to that Confederacy or leave it. You run up the secession flag over our heads. You can not do more to help Mr. Davis' Government than just to compel the Southern portion of the Church to take the position into which this action will force them. Your silence will send a thrill of joy to Washington. Your speaking will send it to Montgomery.

It was not because of secession that the Commissioners from the South were not here. He felt ashamed to tell the real truth; yet why should he? Crops had failed in many portions of the South, and many Presbyteries could not raise the means to send their Commissioners. We were in many instances too poor to come, and shall we be reproached with disloyalty, because we yield to providential necessity? Shall I tell you a secret? Do not any of this vast audience repeat it, for it might not do to tell every where. But he would tell it, and was consoled in venturing in the same way a member of a legislature was, in making a speech that he was afraid would displease his constituents—"Don't report that speech," said he, "but if you do, I don't care, for none of my constituents can read." He (Mr. Baker) could not just say that, for his constituents could read; but still, he would be safe, for the *mails were stopped.* He would tell the secret. He then, with a good deal of dramatic manner, described the way in which those who still loved the Union at the South spoke to each other in whispers; described the way in which he had been approached, with extreme caution, and inquiries made of his intention of coming to the Assembly; of his opinion of what would likely be done; and of the wishes of the Union men at the South that nothing might be done that might render adherence to the Assembly, on the part of the South, impossible.

Such is the report of Mr. Baker's speech in *The Presbyterian.* In other papers he is reported as saying that he

"hated secession;" that he had "never made a prayer for the President of the Confederate States in his pulpit;" also, as "eulogizing the patriotic uprising in the North." At the same time, we find him represented in the *Cincinnati Weekly Gazette* as saying that "if the Southern Commissioners in the Assembly were to be cast off, they would return to their beautiful and glorious South, their fortunes linked with it, and their lives given to its defence."

At the close of Mr. Baker's speech, Dr. Hodge moved to lay the whole subject on the table. The yeas and nays were called for. There were seventy-four yeas to one hundred and thirty-nine nays. So the Assembly refused to lay the whole subject on the table.

On Tuesday, the eleventh day of the proceedings, absentees were allowed to record their votes on the question of laying on the table, so that the vote stood eighty-one yeas to one hundred and forty-six nays. The first order of the day was judicial case number two, but a motion was made to postpone it, so as to take up the unfinished business.

Mr. SMITH, of Ohio, was ready to vote on the loyalty resolutions now.

Dr. MUSGRAVE was, also, now ready to vote for Dr. Spring's resolutions. He would vote for no resolutions that did not express those sentiments.

Dr. HALL, of Rochester, then said he wanted a special committee, so that he could offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That there is a voluntary rebellion in certain States against the constituted authorities of our Government, and that rebellion is a sin of such magnitude among members of the Presbyterian Church as to make them fit subjects for excommunication.

It was then decided, by a vote of one hundred and thirty to eighty-three, to appoint a committee to consider all the papers before the house on this subject. A committee of nine was appointed, viz: Drs. Musgrave, Hodge, Anderson, Wines, and Yeomans, and Judges Ryerson, Semple,

White, and Clark. In the afternoon, they brought in a report, by a majority of the committee (eight out of nine), endorsing the Government, yet softening the language of Dr. Spring's paper. Dr. Anderson read his report, as the minority of the committee, recommending the adoption of Dr. Spring's paper, as modified by the author himself and others, only making the first of July the day of prayer, instead of the fourth. He said, in his speech, that the report of the majority was intended to shirk the crisis and its responsibilities. Its aim was to prevent the Assembly from showing its hand, and coming manfully forward to the support of the country. It was full of weakness and prevarication. There was once a man tried for stealing a sheep. The defence set up was, that he had been an industrious laborer, and was good to his wife—but it said nothing about the sheep. So with the majority's report. They talked of functions, constitutions, etc., etc., but said nothing of the crisis, and its demands upon the Church and the ministry.

On Wednesday, the twelfth day, Dr. Yeomans supported the majority report, and moved that the vote be taken at twelve o'clock.

Rev. Mr. McInnis, of New Orleans, said the Synod of Mississippi, had been striving to get the floor for the last four days. He gave notice, that if the motion to end the debate should pass, he would protest against the action of the Assembly, and withdraw from the body.

A member here said that the speaker had himself voted to lay the whole subject on the table. Mr. McInnis replied, that he was not there to give an account of his vote. Continuing, he said that his section of the country had been misrepresented, and would not submit to be gagged.

It was then voted to take the question at 6 o'clock, P. M.

Mr. McInnis, of New Orleans, again took the platform. He said the Assembly had made up its mind, and that his words would not alter it; but, for all that, he had to make a statement, showing the position and opinions of the Church at the South. No statement from any seceded State had, so far, given the true idea of affairs in that region. The Southern Churches are, as he knew, being a native of the South, perfectly loyal to the Presbyterian Church, and they are loyal to Government. They have in the South a Government which

they are as much bound to obey as you in the North are bound to obey your Government. If Dr. Spring's resolutions are passed, they place us in rebellion to the Government *de facto* at home. The attempt thus to bind our consciences will sever the Presbyterian Church. It was not the province of this Assembly to break our allegiance. They could not say to which Government its members should be loyal. In the support of their Government, the people of the South are both *united* and *determined.* The conduct of the South had been compared to the sin of witchcraft—the same charge might have been made against our revolutionary fathers, contending for their rights. The speaker asked for neither pity nor sympathy for the South, but for her inherent constitutional rights. The speaker was opposed to both of the reports of the Committee. If you are going to force political views upon us, give us a creed that there can be no mistake about.

The speaker thought that the history of the Church and its constitution proved that it was always unsafe to legislate on such subjects. The Assembly is not a legislative body, and its decisions are not law. It is entirely a judicial body. The speaker here read from the "Form of Government" a section which he thought decided that the Assembly had no right to take any political action, except in the way of petition. In this latter form of action the speaker would join; he would sign a petition for peace, for a just and honorable settlement of this whole national difficulty. But if you place me at the mercy of a mere majority of this Assembly, then I say "Farewell!" to all that constitutes Presbyterianism. Is there no limit to the power of this Assembly? Have we no constitution?

Mr. McInnis here read further extracts from the "Form of Government," to show that the power of the Assembly was confined to matters of doctrine, of appeal, and of a judicial character. Errors of doctrine (not political, but theological,) and immorality in practice, can also be dealt with by the Assembly; but no power exists by which it can make a political deliverance. No right exists to force a political vote from a member.

The speaker asked if any Presbytery had sent up an overture on this question? On the contrary, the Presbyteries have ordered us to say nothing on this unhappy subject. At the opening of this Assembly, the body decided to say nothing on the question, and the speaker thought they were no better prepared to speak now. If you could hear the vote of all the Church, you would feel that they desire no utterance. It can not come before us constitutionally. The country does not desire any deliverance from us, nor would it justly appreciate the meaning of our words. Any deliverance we might make to-day we might be ashamed of in a week. Even the Southern Secessionists desire no deliverance from us.

The orator earnestly repeated that any action on this subject by the Assembly would drive off the South and close it for ever against the influence of our Church. The South needs the restraining influence of the North, and the North needs the South; but if we separate, there

can be no reconstruction of the Presbyterian Church. The speaker protested against the division in the name of the Saviour, in the name of the Church, and in the name of the country.

Mr. HARBESON, an Elder from Kentucky, arose about the conclusion of Rev. Mr. McInnis' remarks, and said he fully concurred in all of the speaker's views.

Rev. Mr. OGDEN, of Mississippi, stated that he was a native of New Jersey, a graduate of Princeton, but the last thirty-four years had given his life to the religious education of the slave. He was opposed to the Constitutional views of the previous speaker; but, like him, was opposed to both the majority and minority reports; yet, if compelled, would vote for the majority report. He was opposed to the minority report, because it committed the Church to the Administration of Abraham Lincoln, William H. Seward, and Salmon P. Chase. It perils the union of the Presbyterian Church, and consummates the disunion of these States. If passed, it will gratify every Abolitionist in the country—William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and the like.

He would not accuse Dr. Thomas and others of being Abolitionists, yet he would say, that if they were, they could not have done any thing better to serve the views of Abolitionists than by bringing in these resolutions. The resolutions finding favor with Northern members will commit all the Union men of the South to the Secessionists.

The Rev. Mr. FRAZER, of Kentucky, opened his argument historically, referring to the Church of Scotland, and its connection with the State; he then referred to the Missionary Churches of this body, and asked whether we required them to be loyal to the "United States?" He thought we could not decide the question whether "we have a Government" in this body. The Church could not decide it, but she could take a higher position, and act in her appropriate sphere. There is a sphere found for the civil power to legislate in for the Church, and limits in which the Church can legislate for the State. Neither of these authorities can legislate for each other.

From the days of Constantine, the State had nearly always preserved the unity of the Church. Now, is the Presbyterian Church going to act the tyrant to preserve the unity of the State? Such action would resemble the action of the Roman Catholic Church, which had made kings and emperors bow to it.

If Dr. Spring's resolutions were passed, every loyal Presbyterian in the South would be a traitor to the *de facto* Government, and would be hung on the nearest tree. He was very severe on the conduct of the North-Western brethren, who wish to make the Southern Presbyterians traitors, and earnestly maintained that the Assembly had no right to fix and pronounce upon any man's political allegiance.

Rev. Mr. MUTCHMORE, of Missouri, said it was a sad day for the Church of Jesus, when the Gospel herald must hoist the stars and stripes to be heard at all. The Church in the South, and four-fifths of its Ministers, had been true to the Union.

The Rev. Dr. Breckinridge, and the Rev. John Knox, and others, were cited by the speaker, to show that the Church was in a quandary, at one time, as to whether King James or his rival should be served. So with members of the Assembly now living in the South. The speaker proceeded, in strong terms, to *argue the right of revolution.* The Assembly, in his mind, had no business to take a stand for the constituted authorities, because revolution might be right, if not now, at some time to come.

The speaker was here interrupted by a gentleman, who stated that he would not remain in the Church to hear "treason" preached. The speaker had no right to argue the right of revolution, which was obnoxious to the loyal people of the Assembly and audience.

There were two means of revolution, the ballot-box and the sword. If the second resolution of Dr. Spring was passed, either the Church must be disobeyed, or half his congregation and Presbytery must be dismissed. A member of the speaker's Church might conscientiously oppose the Government, thinking it an engine of tyranny. Should he be dismissed for acting conscientiously? If the General Assembly took Dr. Spring's stand, he should endeavor to obey, but it would require revolvers to carry out the law.

In his State the Governor was a traitor, and a military bill had been passed, requiring the people of Missouri to take oath to support the laws of the State, as expounded by the Jackson Administration.

It were better that Forts Sumter, Pickens, Monroe, and all the rest, should fall, than that the Spring Union resolutions should be passed. In Missouri, the Methodists were the strongest Secessionists, because they had been long embittered with the radicals of the North. Controversy which would ensue upon the Spring resolutions would make the Presbyterians of the South the rankest Secessionists.

Dr. EDWARDS, of Philadelphia, said the Church could not stay its hand in this matter, even if it would. It must deliver an official and authoritative idea of its position. The Reverend Secessionists of South Carolina and Georgia had departed, in the first place, from spiritual discussion; yet, their political friends now raised the argument of non-interference. A missionary of the Old School Assembly was a Chaplain in the Secession ranks; eight Old School preachers were enrolling men, and thousands of Presbyters and members were in the ranks of treason.

In reference to the members of the Assembly present from India, etc., he would say, that the presence of such was no evidence of a world-broad Presbyterianism, for the native delegates of such missions would probably never be present. The Church must be geographically divided, and if so, the North and the North-West could not be lost. If the South must go, so let it be. (Applause in the galleries.)

When the armies of the North had achieved the integrity of the Union anew, the Church would be again reunited.

Dr. Edwards held in his hand a letter from a Philadelphia clergyman to Secretary Chase, asking him if the passage of the Union resolutions would do harm to the Union, even if some of the representatives in the Assembly should withdraw. The following reply was received from Secretary Chase:

"*Can not properly advise, but see no valid objection to unequivocal expressions in favor of the Constitution, Union, and freedom.*

"S. P. CHASE."

(Loud applause.)

Dr. DICKSON then took the floor, and made a statement relative to Judge Bates, reading a letter from that official.

He hoped, afterward, that three minutes would be allowed for meditation and silent prayer before voting.

Much confusion here ensued, as the hour for voting had arrived. Motions and counter-motions were made on every hand, and an effort was made upon the part of each wing to bring their respective report before the Assembly prior to the other.

An appeal from the decision of the Chair, to put the minority report first, with amendments, was lost. Efforts were made to adjourn until this morning, and avoid a vote. Loud cries of "vote," "vote," were made, and there was great confusion. The Assembly refused to adjourn.

The vote was then taken, first on the majority report, which was rejected; and then on the minority report, which was adopted, by a vote of one hundred and fifty-four to sixty-six. To this, Dr. Hodge and forty-five others offered the following protest:

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly, in adopting the minority report of the Committee on the State of the Country. We make this protest, not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our country to be a moral and religious duty, according to the Word of God, which requires every one to be subject to the powers that be, nor because we deny the right of the Assembly to enjoin that and all other like duties on the Ministers and Churches under its care; but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what Government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due, and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our Church. That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, in our judgment, is undeniable. It not only asserts the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises, in the name of all the Churches and Ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to strengthen, uphold and encourage

the Federal Government. It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our Ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound, by the laws of God, to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizens is due to the United States, any thing in the Constitution, ordinances or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding. It is not the loyalty of the members constituting this Assembly, nor of our Churches and Ministers, in any one portion of our country, that is thus asserted, but the loyalty of the whole Presbyterian Church, North, South, East. West. Allegiance to the Federal Government is recognized or declared to be the duty of all the Churches and Ministers represented in this body. In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country—the question, whether is the allegiance of our citizens due primarily to the State or to the Union? However our own convictions of the correctness of this decision may be, or however deeply we may be impressed with its importance, yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide. A man may conscientiously believe that he owes allegiance to one Government or another, and yet possess all the qualifications which the Word of God or the standards of the Church authorize us to demand in our members or Ministers. As this General Assembly represents the whole Church, the acts and declarations of the Assembly become the acts and declarations of the Church. It is this consideration that gives to the action in this case all its importance, either in our own view or in the views of others. It is the allegiance of the Old School Presbyterian Church to the Constitution and the Federal Government, which this paper is intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity, decide the political question which agitates the country. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

That the action of the Assembly in the premises does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a term of membership in our Church, is no less clear. It is not analogous to the recommendation of a religious or benevolent institution, which our members may regard or not at pleasure, but it puts into the mouths of all represented in this body a declaration of loyalty and allegiance to the Union and to the Federal Government; but such declarations, made by the members of our Church residing in what is called the seceding States, is treasonable.

Presbyterians under the jurisdiction of those States, therefore, can not make that declaration. They are, consequently, forced to choose between allegiance to their State and allegiance to the Church.

The General Assembly, in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership of the Church, has, in our judgment, violated the constitution of the Church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master.

We protest, secondly, against this action of the Assembly, because it is a departure from all its previous action. The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the Church has no right to make any thing a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the standards of the Church. We have, at one time, resisted the popular demand to make total abstinence from intoxicating liquors a term of membership; at another time, the holding of slaves. In firmly resisting these unscriptural demands, we have preserved the integrity and unity of the Church, and made it the great conservator of truth, moderation, and liberty of conscience in our country. The Assembly have now descended from this high position, in making a political opinion, a particular theory of the Constitution, however correct and important that theory may be, the condition of membership in our body, and thus, we fear, have endangered the unity of the Church.

In the third place, we protest, because we regard the action of the Assembly uncalled for. It was required neither to instruct nor to excite our brethren in the Northern States. It was not needed as a vindication of the loyalty of the North.

Old School Presbyterians every where, out of the so-called seceding States, have openly avowed, and most conspicuously displayed, their allegiance to the Constitution and the Government; and that, in many cases, at great cost and peril. Nor was such action required by our duty to our country. We are fully persuaded that we best promote the interest of the country by preserving the integrity and union of the Church. We regard this action of the Assembly, therefore, as a great national calamity, as well as the most disastrous to the interest of the Church, which has marked its history.

We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren. It was, in our judgment, unfair to entertain and decide such a momentous question, when the great majority of our Southern Presbyteries were, from necessity, unrepresented in this body; and it is, in our judgment, a violation of the law of love to adopt an act which would expose most of our Southern brethren, should they remain connected with our Church, to suspicion, to the loss of property, to personal dangers, which tends to destroy their usefulness in their appointed fields of labor.

And, finally, we protest, because we believe the action of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the Church, but greatly weaken its power for good, and expose it to the danger of being carried away more and more from its true principles, by a wordly or fanatical spirit.

We have patiently labored through this long and absurd debate (most of which was as wicked as absurd), that we might here put on record the names of all these speakers, and the sentiments uttered by them. As reported by the weekly journals alone, the whole might possibly have perished, and been forgotten. We have probably secured for it immortality. In our pages it will no doubt live, in at least some few *bound up* copies, and descend to generations following, for their instruction and warning. The future Church historian will note the principles asserted by this body of Presbyterian Ministers and Ruling Elders—principles which are in violation of the constitution of the Church, and destructive of the crown-rights of the Church's Head. It will be seen hereafter, by the student of these times, how a new term of communion was invented and imposed. It will be seen how a majority sought to impose on a minority the necessity of committing treason, on pain of being cut off from Church privileges. It will be seen how the encouragement and support of a human government, and that an unrighteous one, was made the altar on which the unity and peace of the Church, which we have all sworn to study and to seek, was sacrificed. Presbyterian Assemblies have sometimes, before now, been servile in their adulation of royal persons—but hitherto, in this country, Presbyterian Assemblies have always sympathized with the defenders of regulated freedom. Our fathers of the old Synod, whenever it became necessary to speak about the duties of the citizen, always spoke for the country, and against the tyrant. Their patriotism was an intelligent thing; and they held it a sacred duty of British subjects to defend their rights as Britons. They believed that a free people might not justly nor legitimately be forced to submit to rulers not of their own choosing; and that the free sons of free sires were under a religious obligation to transmit, if possible, to their children, their sacred inheritance of constitutional liberty. But here sat an Assembly,

which made its chief business the passage of "the *loyalty resolutions*"—as if in this Republic loyalty were a thing due from the people to the officers of Government, and not, rather, from the officers of Government, high and low, military and civil, to the people and their Constitution. Alas! for the noble Church that has fallen the victim of an insidious, as well as cruel, fanaticism. Dr. Spring, in that body, was really the cat's-paw of Dr. McMaster. He it was, who, though not a member, yet, through Drs. Thomas and Monfort, and a few other Abolitionists, made himself the master-spirit of that feeble Assembly. The hitherto insignificant elements of positive Abolitionism amongst us rose to the agitated surface of things in that sycophantic body, and, with the hue and cry of patriotism on its lips, and with bitter malice against the South in its heart, triumphed over the timid, uncertain, demoralized opposition that encountered it. Where was Dr. Hodge? He was there, but he was not there as *a leader* any more. He was there, to be ridiculed, and opposed, and *snubbed*, and put down. Coolly did Dr. Monfort tell him (as we were privately informed) that the election of Professor Moffat to Princeton Seminary, over Mr. Shields (Dr. Hodge's candidate), was the punishment of his opposing the "loyalty resolutions," and was also to teach him that there is a North-West, which will drive him, next year, out of Princeton Seminary! Yes! Dr. Hodge was there, to have his protest answered by no other pen than that of Dr. Thomas, of Ohio—this Old School Presbyterian Assembly actually appointing such a man as that to represent her against Charles Hodge! He was there; but the South, against whose sacred cause he had so lately used all his influence, and upon whose devoted head he had helped to launch the terrors of this atrocious war, was not there, as always hitherto, to sustain him and the other conservatives, against the pressure that was upon

them, and so he and they, and the Old School Presbyterian Church of the North, went down together.

The debate on the state of the country was divided between three different classes of speakers. There was, first, the class led by Dr. Thomas—the man who *dared* the Assembly to shrink in this crisis, and "be blown away like the foam from the crest of the billow." He was supported by Dr. Anderson, the man who had "dear friends in the army, and wanted to encourage them." He it was who ridiculed Dr. Hodge's paper as "milk-and-water sophistry." Dr. Thomas was supported, also, by Judge Ryerson, who had long been aware of the wicked designs of little South Carolina upon the mighty Union, and who had no respect at all for the "sheer conspiracy" which Southern men call their Government. Then there was Mr. Hastings, who scared the Assembly with the danger of resisting the intense and giant patriotism that had been awakened. It was he that shook in their pale faces the letter "received at noon from a very prominent citizen." There was, also, Dr. Musgrave, who saw in secession "a monstrous immorality—a ruinous error, that ought to be crushed out, at once and for ever—that ought to be swept from the face, not only of this country, but of the earth;" which terrible words he spake for the "encouragement of all loyal hearts in the South." His tongue was loud and smooth on the subject of the Government's gracious protection of Maryland, which he hoped "would soon be extended to some other States." There was, also, Mr. Waller, drawing out the comparison in full, of secession from Mr. Lincoln's Government with the apostacy of our first parents from God. He was the man to denounce, on Scripture authority, this "rebellion," as being "like witchcraft, worthy of death;" and yet the confession came out of him, that, after all, the justice of the death he would inflict depended on the legitimacy of the Government, and that that legitimacy did admit of being doubted. And, finally, there was Dr. Lord, with like ser-

vile adulation of the Government, urging on the Assembly how much the Church owed to it, and how every interest of the Church was in jeopardy if the United States Government were prostrated! Well might he close his speech with an apostrophe to the star-spangled banner, under whose folds he had just put the Church! That eloquent apostrophe, so suitable to the time and the place, lacked only one additional touch, to have made the effect of it perfectly irresistible. Dr. Lord should have *sung the whole song from the platform*, and the Assembly should have joined in it, as we are informed has come to be a common practice in the Northern Churches. Alas! for the Church, when the banner of the Cross is thus displaced, and her Head and Saviour has His honor given to Cæsar! Along with all these speeches of flattery to the Government, put the fact that, once and again, the Cabinet must be asked, by telegrams, to direct the course of this Assembly, and that their wishes are referred to, over and over again, as authority for the action taken. It was a just remark of a writer in the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, that, toward the Government of the United States, the tone of this free-born General Assembly was as abject as that of the most servile English Parliament towards the fiercest of the Tudors, or that of the Roman Senate, in the worst days of imperial despotism, toward the most sanguinary of the Cæsars.

The second class of speakers in the Assembly was composed of Drs. Hodge, Yeomans, Backus, and, perhaps, one or two others. These were the only representatives of the conservative North. In our judgment, the ablest speech of the Assembly, from amongst the men of the North, was that of Dr. Yeomans, and that, we are sorry to add, since we respect Dr. Yeomans so highly, is not saying much. Dr. Hodge's speech had its strong points, too, and they were well put, but it was chiefly a mere appeal to considerations of expediency. Both Dr. Hodge and Dr. Yeomans acknowledged in full the righteousness of the war, and there

was, therefore, no power in them to withstand the demand for an expression of sympathy with the Government. The fierce and savage uprising of the North, to wage a war of invasion and of every horror against the South, simply because these free Southern States have claimed their independence, Dr. Hodge said, is more "sublime and grand than was ever heard of before." And Dr. Yeomans told his people, just before leaving them, that it is a great "struggle which must be fought through, once for all." With such utterances on their lips, how could they expect to keep back the Assembly from declaring *its* sympathy, also, with this "grand and sublime struggle?" Both of them were willing to make the unity of the Church subsidiary to the Union of the States, and Dr. Hodge, especially, urged the continuance of the former chiefly on that ground; thus making Christ's kingdom to be *of this world;* and yet, they both sanctioned the war which renders disunion, both in Church and in State, as permanent as complete.

The third class of speakers in the Assembly, was the small class of Southern Commissioners. We do not desire to intensify at all the feelings of disapprobation with which it is becoming evident that Southern Presbyterians have regarded the course of these brethren generally. We would treat them with all possible forbearance, on the ground of its not being at all certain that they have been justly represented by the reporters. One thing, however, we think is very certain. They put themselves into a false position by appearing at all in the Assembly. Previous to the opening of the Assembly, the war had commenced. Southern men, therefore, had no business at the North, nor in that house. To go to an enemy's country, and to stay there, and to meet in counsel with those enemies, and to take part in their debates—this was, all, or any part of it, bad enough. But to take such a part in these debates as has been ascribed to most of the Southern speakers, is worse than we can well express. We will not attempt to express it. We would

not say too much, lest we should be unjust to them; we would not say too little, lest we should be unjust to that dear and sacred cause which they appear to us to have so much damaged.

We have dwelt upon the sycophantic adulation of the Government by the Assembly; of the voting at the outset to meet next year at Springfield, Illinois, where Mr. Lincoln comes from, and at Washington, where he holds his court; and of the telegrams asking the Administration to direct the proceedings of the body. The reader also remembers how one great Doctor of Divinity held himself forth as the "*representative*" of Mr. Secretary Bates, and as the man who had actually held the correspondence, by telegraph, with that distinguished functionary. Before passing away to another topic, let us just allude to a significant little circumstance mentioned by the *Cincinnati Weekly Gazette*, in its account of the proceedings. It was, indeed, a *little* thing, every way, but it shows the character of the body. It evinces the calibre and the tone of the men who were so loud in hounding on the dogs of war upon the South. It declares how incapable was that Assembly of rising to the seriousness of the occasion and the case before them—how little in earnest they were—though met together in such sad and earnest times. The *Gazette* is speaking of the very afternoon when Dr. Spring's resolutions were adopted. It says:

> Prior to the commencement of the afternoon session, when the house was moderately filled, an artist photographed the scene, the prominent or forward members of the body taking standing positions in the pulpit. The scene may yet become historical with the Presbyterian Church.

With regard to the question of the right and duty of the General Assembly, or of the Synod, or of the Minister in his pulpit, to enjoin upon the people their duty to Government, we have no doubts whatever. We think in nothing was the weakness of the Southern Commissioners more

manifest than in their constant, but vain, efforts to disprove this right and duty. None have been more hostile than we to "political parsons," or to untimely intermeddling with civil affairs by bodies of Ministers. But there are, without doubt, *morals in politics*, which sometimes demand a testimony. There is duty to God in respect to country and to rulers, to ancestors and to posterity; and there is duty, also, directly to all these last. The second table of the law must be preached, as well as the first. And not only may a Church court, as we conceive, testify to the citizens, individually and separately, respecting their civil duties, but that court may sometimes be required to testify to the nation itself. The nation is a moral person. It can sin, and it will be punished if it do not repent. Wisdom, of course, is profitable to direct, when the occasion has come which demands the instruction of the Ministry and the testimony of the Church court respecting the affairs and the duties of the nation. But it does seem to us, that, if there ever was an occasion when Church teachers might legitimately have spoken, and were under obligations to speak, to the Church and to the country, about duty and about sin, that occasion was when the last Assembly met. Just think of the ground which those must take who deny the Assembly's right to speak: Here was, on the theory of the North, a sinful rebellion against the Government, gotten up in certain States where the Assembly had many Ministers and Churches; while, on the theory of the South, here was a wicked war of invasion waging by the Federal Government against free and sovereign States—that Federal Government being the agent of the North, where, also, the Assembly had many Ministers and Churches. The consequences of this struggle were to be dreadful in the highest degree and on the largest scale. Thousands of men were likely to be slaughtered at a time. Widows and orphans were to fill the land. Every species of wickedness was to increase and multiply in the train of the war, and,

in a word, inexpressible misery as well as guilt was involved on the one side, or on the other, or on both. Yet, while the moral sense of all the world is shocked at the idea of such a fratricidal war and its consequences, the General Assembly were to have no moral sense whatever on the subject! The very spectacle of it, the confused noise in their ears of the battle itself, and the warrior's garments rolled in blood before their very eyes, is not to call off their attention for a moment from their more important affairs of routine and red tape! It seems to us to be the absurdest possible notion of our Church Government, that the Confession of Faith forbids the Church court from speaking out for justice, and right, and peace, in such a case as this. The very idea casts *ridicule*, yes, *reproach*, upon the Assembly, as a body of reverend recluses in white cravats and black coats, too sanctimoniously busy with their own holy or unholy pursuits—too much engrossed with the pious squabbles of the body—to turn an ear for one moment to the cry of a bleeding country. This preposterous conception of the Church's duty arises from simply failing to draw the very obvious distinction between mere politics and a great religious question. If a whole congregation were going out, immediately after service, to a murderous assault upon their innocent neighbors; or if, on the other hand, they were going out to rebel against lawful authority, and if their pastor knew it, ought he to preach not a word of warning against their sin? If the members of all our Churches were joining in this war, on the one side or on the other, and if the Assembly believed that one side was wicked aggression, and the other side rightful resistance, could they, ought they, to be silent, and not testify upon this moral and religious question? We know that an Assembly constituted like ours could hardly have one opinion on such a question, and that whatever it might say must be condemned either at the North or at the South. That only shows how impossible it would be for a body so con-

stituted to hold together in such circumstances—it does not disprove their duty to testify to whatever might seem to them to be right in the premises.

What, therefore, as it seems to us, the Southern Commissioners ought to have attacked, was not the Assembly's undertaking to enjoin the duty due to the Government, but the way in which they performed their undertaking. It ought to have been demonstrated that the Assembly was giving the wrong kind of testimony. There ought to have come forth from amongst the Southern Commissioners some adequate exhibition of the rights of the country from which they came—a country of eleven sovereign States—which had renounced the unfaithful and usurping central agency they joined in creating, and had set up a new Confederacy. What a glorious opportunity it was for some man in the Assembly, whether from the South or from the North, whether from the East or from the West, to have spoken strongly, clearly, fully, adequately, on behalf of the rights of these States; on behalf of regulated liberty—that precious gift of God to so few of the nations, but inherited, through His favor, by Britons, and still more fully by Americans; on behalf of the Constitution—that compact violated on one side, and, therefore, on all sides; on behalf of truth, and justice, and honesty, and fairness, and peace, between all the equal parties to that national compact. If there had been some Dr. Witherspoon there, how he would have stood up for the States against Abraham I., as he stood up for the Colonies against George III. Had the General Assembly but risen to the sublimity of the occasion, and, laying Dr. Spring's resolutions—not on the table, but under it—had they testified, before God, to their people that this is a wicked war which Mr. Lincoln is, without color of constitutional authority, waging against the Confederate States; and had they called on their people to exert themselves on behalf of justice and peace towards their brethren, who desire nothing from the North which

belongs to the North, asking only for their plain right to govern themselves; if the Assembly had spoken in some such sense as this, how becoming had been their action, and how beneficent their influence. We shall be told, of course, by the Southern Commissioners, that it had been altogether in vain for them to have attempted any such full and complete testimony as that, for it would not only not have had any good effect, but it would not have been listened to—that the Assembly would have silenced any such thorough and full defence of the South as treason. Then we say, this only shows that Southern men had no business to be in any such Assembly.

All that we have now said is quite in harmony with the views which we and others of the South have hitherto asserted, and which prevailed in the Assembly of 1860, respecting the unlawfulness of interference by the Assembly with *secular* affairs. This matter was *ecclesiastical*, and that in the highest sense, and for the strongest reasons. And the Assembly could not have innocently omitted to notice it. Their misfortune was, that they did not view it in the only right way—that they did not rebuke the unjust—yea, murderous spirit of Northern Ministers, and Churches, and people. We do not see how any gathering of Ministers and Christian men, in any part of the country, can neglect to speak, loudly and distinctly, their views of this war. It is their own responsibility if they speak on the wrong side. Speak they must, for it is the grandest drama of wickedness, on the one side or on the other, that the respective parties ever were engaged in. And let all sections of what was once the American people be aware of this. Let them look to the stand they are occupying, for it is full of responsibility. Let them do all things in this case in God's name, and in God's fear, for to Him, as Judge amongst the nations, they must give account.

The action of the Synod of South Carolina at its last meeting, often referred to in the Assembly, is altogether in

harmony with what we have always maintained, as well as with what we are now maintaining. It was moved in that Synod that we immediately separate from the Old School Presbyterian Church, because of the Act of 1818, which, with other circumstances, evinced her to be hostile to the South. The ground upon which this course was urged was, that fidelity to the South required it of the Synod. The motion was laid upon the table; by a vote of seventy-seven to twenty-one. A minute explaining this very significant disposal of a motion which had appealed, but in vain, to such a sacred principle, was then adopted, with but one dissenting voice. That minute declared truly that the General Assembly, in its annual meetings, had always accorded both justice and courtesy to the Southern members; and that the Act of 1818 had been adopted by the South of that day, as well as by the North, and virtually had been rescinded in the action of 1845. As to separation, it was said the Synod could not inaugurate it, because that was not the time for such a step, nor was the Synod the proper body to initiate such a movement. It was not for the Church to anticipate the State in dividing from the North; and it was not for the Synod, but for the Sessions and Presbyteries, to take the first steps, whenever the time should come. Then the Synod proceeded to say it was not for her to instruct the citizens in their ordinary political duties; but that the great and solemn question before the State, whether she would give up her inheritance of freedom, and her very being and life, had a religious bearing, and involved duty to God; to ancestors; to posterity; to our very slaves. The Synod doubted not that the State ought to make a stand for the precious rights which were the correlative of all these solemn duties. And she exhorted our Churches and people to go forward in the solemn path of their duty, putting their trust in God, and, also, assured them of her benediction and her prayers.

Of course, the so nearly unanimous adoption of that minute implied plainly that the members of the Synod had studied the question of the rights involved in the controversy between the South and the North—had studied the Constitution of the United States and of their own State, and were convinced that there was involved a precious and sacred inheritance of rights, which could not be surrendered without sin against God. And well had it been for the Assembly, in Philadelphia, had they, also, understood the question at issue, and been prepared to take a proper view of the relative rights and duties of the belligerents in this case. We cheerfully commit the action of the Synod of South Carolina, in comparison with that of the Assembly, to the judgment of impartial posterity.

The Presbyterian Church, Old School, is, therefore, of course, soon to be formally divided. It is now, in one sense, divided already, for there is no more union of feeling between the two parts. The Northern majority have so legislated against us, as to show that in their hearts they are not at one with us; and so legislated against us, as that we certainly can not be at one with them. Now, the question arises, what is it that both *will* soon, and *ought* soon, to divide this Church? Is it these mutual feelings of alienation? Do they, can they, justify actual separation, and the setting up of a new and distinct Presbyterian Church organization? We have no hesitation in answering, No! Such feelings as produce unjust and unkind legislation, and such feelings, too, as it produces, ought to be controlled and corrected. They form no justification of schism.

Is it, then, that the late Assembly has made a term of Church membership which we can not agree to? In ordinary circumstances, we would answer, with equal readiness, No! If the new term they have made were not so peculiar in its nature and bearing, that would undoubtedly be our answer. To make a new term of membership is extra-Constitutional action, and simply null and void. The Gen-

eral Assembly has no power or authority to do any such thing. It has only a judicial power of interpreting and declaring the laws of Christ. But whenever it gives a wrong interpretation of them, no man's conscience is bound thereby. Were it not, therefore, that the "loyalty resolutions" of the Assembly must necessarily affect our position towards our own Government, we would say, unhesitatingly, that they do not render necessary any division of the Church. And, notwithstanding this bearing of the Assembly's action, we are much inclined to the belief that those resolutions do not, of themselves, constitute any necessary or justifying ground of a separation. We might repudiate the resolutions—we might defy the Assembly, as violating the Constitution thereby—and we might still continue in the Church of our fathers. If there were no other and better reason for division, we conceive that this unconstitutional action would neither compel nor justify it. This is not the ground on which, of itself, we, for one, are willing to put our departure. Nor would the additional circumstance suffice, that the Assembly have really reënacted the Act of 1818. That, also, is simply the judgment of a fallible court, which judgment ought to be, and might be, subsequently reversed. All such offences by the Assembly against truth and right, as we have now been considering, do but require the Presbyteries to appear in the next Assembly, and, with the help of the conservative men of the North, if any there now be, endeavor to rectify all these errors. And, if defeated, then it would be our duty to renew the conflict, and hope for some future vindication of the truth to be successful. Just as, if the Assembly were to enact any other heresy, we would not think of therefore giving up our birthright and retiring, until, at least, we had fought some good fighting in its defence. We are satisfied of the entire justice of this position. If the Church had been at liberty to divide whenever any Council or Synod made any unjust or erroneous decree,

she would just have been dividing all the time, from the beginning until now. Synods and Councils have been prone to err. What is a General Assembly, but two or three hundred fallible men, acting for a constituency which may at any time reverse their decisions? Dr. Breckinridge once said, with characteristic point, that God had ordained that the General Assembly should every now and then decree itself *an ass.*

What is it, then, that *must*, and *ought* to divide the Presbyterian Church, Old School? It is the division of the country into two separate nations. No external Church organization of a spiritual Church can properly perform its spiritual functions within the limits of two distinct nations. And the more hostile they become, the more impossible will it be for one Church to work in the bounds of both. There is no need to spend much time in arguing this point. All Church history illustrates the truth of what we say. The Romish Church is no exception, because, in point of fact, she, also, is divided into many distinct national organizations, which are but indirectly connected together through the Pope. The Gallic Church, for example, never has been in any other but this indirect way connected with the Church in Spain or Italy. Each one is fully organized within, by a separate and independent organization, only they are all subject to the same Pope—except when it happens that there are two or three of these. We suppose, in the present case, the Romish dioceses of the North and those of the South will be organized into separate Archbishoprics. But, whether they shall be so organized or not, the Romish Church is no exception to what we said above, because that Church can not be considered, in the full and high sense of that term, a *spiritual* Church. With her, on the contrary, all is material, mechanical, external. She is a purely visible society, having a visible head on the earth. The union between the members of that Church, the world over, is not spiritual, but external. It does not depend on

the bond of any internal, religious, or moral character. It depends simply on the profession of the same creed, the use of the same sacraments, and the acknowledgment of the same Pope. Within these few and wide limits, therefore, no obstacles to their unity arise from differences of ideas or opinions. The sphere of their Church is not the sphere of the life, or of thought or feeling. Every kind of moral notion may prevail amongst them, even the most opposite ones, and their outward Church union is not thereby disturbed. Quite different is the case with every spiritual Church, where each member is to be united to every other, as well as to an invisible Head, by a faith which appeals to the intellect and to the heart, and which always affects the character. Here there must be identity, in some good degree, of moral judgments, feelings, and sympathies, or the unity is broken. For here opinions are free. Here there is discussion, and here, owing to weakness on one or both sides, there arise prejudices, and these are obstacles to union, and to the accomplishment together of the Church's work. In the case of every such free Church, therefore, having the domain of the intellect and the heart for its sphere of operation and influence, the separation of national interests becomes an obstacle to union, which can not be disregarded. Differences of political organization, therefore, must divide such Churches. There were, in the beginning, the different Churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia, and Ephesus, etc., etc. No one Church organization can operate successfully under two Governments. The necessity for separation is absolute. But the real unity of the Spirit is no more sacrificed in this case, than when the separation is produced by language, or by race, or by the ocean, or by the ages.

So, also, the case of our own Missionary Synods in India forms no exception. They are but exotics, submitting, of course, necessarily, for a time, to many untoward circumstances and influences. Wait till they take root in the soil,

and we shall see them organize the Presbyterian Church of the Indies.

But we have taken root already, and are no exotics. Our case is that of a Church extending into all parts of this broad land, and the country suddenly disrupted politically. And how can the old organization successfully operate in these two separate Confederacies? This question was settled for the Church, in our apprehension, on the same day which settled it for the country. And, just as it was the earnest wish of the Southern States, in their separation from the North, to take a peaceable departure from their late sisters, and to maintain with them always the most friendly relations, so did we fondly hope that the inevitable separation thus to be brought upon the Church would be a peaceable separation, and no schism. That pleasant dream of a secession for the States which should be peaceable, we confess that we ourselves did dream, and long did we refuse to be waked up from it. We can hardly yet believe that we are awake, and that we find war between the North and South an actual reality. Just so in reference to our dream for the Church. We have been waked up from it, to find ourselves virtually *cut off*, and practically *turned out*. We are in the condition of the Apostles when cast out of the Synagogue. Well, it is not the first exodus God's people ever made. Israel made an exodus from Egypt. It is not the first *Presbyterian exodus*, either. The Free Church of Scotland made an exodus from their National Church, Erastianized. And accepting, as, *in view of our divided nationality*, we all certainly shall accept, that exodus which many Southern Presbyterians consider to be, even otherwise, forced upon us by the Erastianized Church of the North, our humble, but earnest, hearty, and cheerful hope is, that, disowned by the servants, we are acknowledged by the Son and the Lord and Master. This is enough for us. We do not doubt that He has a work for us to do, and that He will enable us to perform it. Our hearts bound forward in the pathway of

this new Presbyterian exodus. We hasten to meet the new and glorious future which seems to rise up before us, and to beckon us onwards.

Our own impressions were, at first, favorable to no immediate action towards the formal separation. We preferred to have the Presbyteries take the needful action at their regular Fall meetings. But we are now convinced that the general and the clamorous call, from so many parts of the South, for a Convention to assemble, without unnecessary delay, and take the necessary steps for organizing a separate Southern Church, is the voice of God on the subject. It is the instinctive demand of the Church's feelings. And the instincts of Zion's heart are apt to be right. It does appear to us, that, having been put into a false position, both by the Assembly and by our own Commissioners, we must not delay at all to set ourselves right. We owe this to our Northern brethren, in so far as it may be possible to reach them by any declarations of ours. We owe it still more to our country—our country, the Confederate States. We must have opportunity to declare, immediately and loudly, with how much indignation we repel the attempt to coerce us to be traitors to her. And still more, if possible, do we owe it to ourselves—to our own convictions and our own feelings, which will not let us rest as the thing now stands—to repudiate, in the most formal and solemn manner possible, and as soon as possible, the attitude which they would have compelled us to assume.

It is a sad thing to have had such an end made of "the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." We think impartial history will testify that the South, in this case, as in the civil disruption, has not been the aggressor. We humbly trust such will be the Master's judgment, also. He is a gracious Lord. We are complete in Him. We again declare our confidence that He will not forsake nor disown us. He will condescend to use us and our poor labors. We have a glorious work to do in these

Confederate States, and in our share of the Foreign Missionary field. Let us gird up our loins for the vigorous discharge of these sacred and delightful obligations!

P. S.—Since the above was sent to press, accounts have reached us of the further and final proceedings of the Assembly.

REMOVAL OF BOARDS FROM PHILADELPHIA.

Dr. DICKSON moved to remove the Board of Education to Baltimore. The Corresponding Secretary was in favor of it.

Mr. WALLER moved to refer the subject to the next Assembly.

Mr. ROBERTSON moved a Committee to consider the propriety of removing the Boards of Education and of Domestic Missions to Pittsburgh, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, or other cities, and to report necessary changes.

After some discussion, in view of the lateness of the day, the whole subject was indefinitely postponed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

Mr. WALLER continued his speech, on the want of economy and the expensiveness of the whole arrangements.

Dr. EDWARDS said, if the Boards had had trouble, they had brought it on themselves. There must be a clear showing; nothing kept under the hand.

Dr. SCHENCK replied, that nothing was hidden in the reports of the Board, save the capital, and this had not been called for in the Assembly till now.

Various efforts to procure a vote of some kind of censure of the Board, were then made by Drs. Edwards and Musgrave, but all failed, and a very favorable report was adopted.

MINUTES OF SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

The exceptions reported by the Committee were taken up *seriatim*.

The first was that "the book has not been sent up for three years." Agreed to.

The second was "against the statement, by the Synod, that the act of 1818 had been virtually repealed." After some discussion, agreed to.

The third exception was "against the solemn counselling of a popular movement against the Government of the United States."

Dr. HALL moved to add to the exception the words: "Inasmuch as it is inexpedient for the judicatures of our Church to give political deliverances."

Mr. VAILL said he would propose, as an addition to that, these words: "Except in the case of the General Assembly."

Dr. HODGE moved, as a substitute for the third exception, as reported, the following: "In approving these minutes the Assembly is not to be understood as endorsing the action of the Synod in reference to the political course of the State of South Carolina." Adopted.

REVISED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

Mr. CLARK offered a resolution, directing the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Discipline to meet in Pittsburg, on Tuesday, August 13, at 7, P. M., and that the members present be a quorum.

This resolution seems to have been adopted. It is a virtual displacing of all the Southern members of the Committee, the Chairman, Dr. Thornwell, included.

The following is the letter of Dr. Thornwell, as Chairman of the Committee, read to the Assembly. It is said to have produced very general indications of mingled surprise and derision in the Assembly, many of the members repeating over and over to themselves, in a whisper, its closing expression, "your country and mine."

DEAR BRETHREN: It becomes my duty, as Chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Discipline, to state the reasons why the orders of the last Assembly have not been complied with. The Committee have been able to have no meeting at all. During the whole of last summer I was absent from the country, and did not return until some time in October. I left immediately after the dissolution of the Assembly.

I intended to call the Committee together about Christmas, but the political troubles, which at that time began to thicken upon us, rendered it inexpedient, if not impracticable. At no time since has it been possible to have a meeting; and, even if the condition of the country had allowed, my health, since the middle of January, has been so poor that I have attempted no public duty of any kind.

I am persuaded, however, that the Church is put to no real inconvenience by not having a report from the Committee of Revision. The Assembly could not consider it. Other issues, much more pressing, and much more solemn, are upon us. This whole subject will have to lie over until more quiet times. Brethren, I invoke upon your deliberations the blessings of the Most High.

I sincerely pray that He may guide you, by the inspiration of His Spirit, into wise and holy measures; that He may save the Church

from every false step; that He may make her a messenger of peace in these troublous times; and that He may restore harmony and good will between your country and mine.

Most truly, yours,

J. H. THORNWELL.

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Biblical Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen. With an Appendix on the Catholic Epistles, and an Introductory Essay on the Life and Writings of St. John.* By Dr. JOHN H. A. EBRARD. Translated by Rev. W. B. POPE, Manchester. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1860; pp. 416, 8vo.

Dr. Ebrard is one of the most learned, earnest and zealous divines of Germany. A Bavarian by birth and education, and a Huguenot by descent, he unites to the impulsive energy of the French, the minute learning of the Germans. He is one of the leading advocates of the Reformed Church in his own country, adopting, as our own standards do, the Calvinistic view of the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament, but approaching more nearly the Melancthonian than the higher Calvinistic type in his theology. Though in the prime of life, his works have already become numerous. Among the most considerable are his Critical History of the Life of Christ; his Dogmatic Theology; his History of the Lord's Supper, from the Apostles down; his Collection of the Reformed Liturgies; his Lectures on Practical Theology; his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the Apocalypse. Besides these, he has been a frequent contributor to the *Studien und Kritiken*, and to Herzog's Encyclopedia.

The commentary on the Epistles of John exhibits all the learning and heartiness which characterize the author. The first Epistle, which is without the usual salutation and inscription, he regards as a document written to accompany the Gospel, and, as it were, an epistle dedicatory. It is a concentrated and condensed summary of the Gospel of John, the same with it in subject, written at the commencement of the Apostle's exile, for the benefit of the Churches of Proconsular Asia, now deprived of his oral instructions and pastoral supervision. It was written in opposition to the lying doctrines of Cerinthus, a townsman of John at Ephesus, who made of Jesus a mere man, to whom the Aeon *Christ* became united at His baptism, and again separated from Him before His passion. Against Judaic heresies the Gospel of Luke was especially written, and Paul strenuously contended. The Gnostic element was now disturbing the Church, and John, whose mind was contemplative, rather than logical, and whose character was the complement of the other disciples, was reserved for this occasion, to give forth the complement of their exhibition of Christ and His doctrine.

The Commentary of Ebrard on the Epistles of John is, as we might anticipate, learned and thorough. His argumentative defence of his own interpretations against those of his contemporaries, Luecke, Düsterdieck, and Huther, are more minute, perhaps, than the American reader would desire. His doctrinal explanations are not always all we would wish. Still, the student will find this a valuable help to the critical study of the Epistles of John, "which reflect a mind penetrated through and through by the light of the Spirit of God," so that "the expositor, like the readers, hears the cry at the entrance: 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'"—Ebrard, p. 41.

2. *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series,* 1574–1660. *Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office.* Edited by W. Noel Sainsbury, Esq., Honorary Member of the New England, New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina Historical Societies. Under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and with the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonial Department. London: 1860; pp. 577, royal 8vo.

This is a publication of great importance in reference to the early history of the Anglo-American Colonies. It rehearses the main substance of the numerous papers touching the early colonization of North America, which are found in the Colonial Office, from Elizabeth to the restoration of Charles II. It embraces a large amount of information, sometimes curious and sometimes authentic. Certain fabulous accounts of the riches of this wilderness are found, such as that "in every cottage pearl is to be met with, in some houses a peck." That about the bar of "St. Maries" fire dragons are to be seen "which make the air very red as they fly." "The streets broader than London streets. Banquetting houses built of crystal, with pillars of massive silver, and sometimes of gold. Pieces of clear gold as big as a man's fist in the heads of some of the rivers. Great abundance of silk worms." Giving, as it does, the contents of the various documents in the Colonial Office, it directs the historian to the original sources of information as to early discoveries on our coast, and the settlements from time to time attempted. It is of especial service, as illustrating the earliest history of Virginia and New England, and the islands and dependencies Britain still holds on these coasts. This volume, however, stops short of the date at which Carolina was effectually settled, and contributes nothing to the elucidation of her history, except an account of the unsuccessful attempt to colonize South

Carolina in the year 1629, by French Protestants, under the directions of Mons. Bellavene and the Baron de Sancé. The colonists were taken to Virginia, and the whole scheme frustrated. Could this publication be encouraged, and brought down to the times of the American Revolution, it would be of the greatest utility in reference to the history of the several States of North America. It is a work, however, of such labor and expense, that it could only be carried to its completion by the aid of Government. America is far more interested in it than Britain. Nothing, however, can be done till this cruel war, which now oppresses us, is at an end.

---

3. *A New Digest of the Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Compiled by the order and authority of the General Assembly.* By Rev. WM. E. MOORE. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee. pp. 633, 8vo.

The preceding is the title of the Digest of the Acts of the General Assembly, as set forth by our New School brethren. It was prepared by a committee appointed by the (New School) Assembly, in 1854, of which the compiler was one. The material, down to the period of the division of the Church, in 1837, '8, is the same, necessarily, with that of our own Church, prepared with such labor, and so satisfactorily, by Rev. Samuel J. Baird. To this compilation the committee of the New School Assembly acknowledge themselves greatly indebted. The work is printed in excellent style, on firm paper, with clean page, and a table of contents and index open and plain to the eye, and remarkably easy for reference. The volume is less in its number of pages than our own Digest. "Much," says the compiler, "has been omitted that is now obsolete, or that was temporary, or that pertains to institutions not

now under our control. For the most part, reports, protests, proposals, and other papers, not the Acts of the Assembly, have been omitted. But where the very words of the records are not used, the fact is signified by brackets."

---

4. *Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with other Treatises.* By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D. D., Professor of Theology at Berlin. Translated from the German by D. W. SIMON. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1860; pp. 488, 8vo.

Though this volume has been in our hands some months, it has not been convenient for us to notice it hitherto, and this now tardy recognition of it can be of little service to any. Its author is well known as one of the most uncompromising enemies of Rationalism that has yet arisen in Germany, and has dealt it some of the severest blows it has ever met with. His great work on the Old Testament Christology, his masterly defence of the Pentateuch and of Daniel, have given him an established reputation as a man of learning and an able and fearless champion of the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God. The least satisfactory of all his writings is his Commentary on the Apocalypse, which certainly did not add to his reputation as a sober interpreter of prophecy. The reader will find the present work on Ecclesiastes pervaded by a pious spirit, and if he does not agree with him as to its authorship, and the time of its composition, will yet find it a valuable help to the understanding of this deeply interesting, and, to some extent, difficult portion of the Sacred Scriptures. Dr. Hengstenberg does not regard Solomon as the writer of Ecclesiastes. He accepts the view of Grotius and the Rationalists, that its composition belongs to a later age, which he conceives to be the period when the Persians held dominion over the people of God, and they were oppressed under the powers of this world. Wisdom is

introduced as a person speaking to men, in the character of Koheleth, the Assembler (Preacher), and this Koheleth is none other than Solomon himself, presented to our view as the incarnation of wisdom. For our own part, we see nothing in the arguments of Hengstenberg sufficiently convincing to induce us to relinquish the common opinion, which ascribes the book to Solomon as its author, and supposes it to have been composed after his experience of earthly pleasure, as he looked back, humbled and penitent, over a life in which he had strayed far from the path of duty. To us this is the most consistent view of its authorship, though abandoned by most of the modern scholars of Germany. The other treatises contained in this volume are, Prolegomena to the Song of Solomon, a Lecture on the Book of Job, a Lecture on the Prophet Isaiah, an Essay on the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture, and a discussion on the Jews in their relation to the Christian Church. In this last he contends against the Literalists, who hold to a future glorious kingdom of the Jews, and the continued nationality of converted Israel.

---

5. *The Beauty of Immanuel. His Name shall be called Wonderful.* By LEROY J. HALSEY, D. D., author of "Life Pictures from the Bible," "Literary Attractions," etc. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 204, 12mo.

This little volume resembles its predecessor, "Life Pictures from the Bible," and is written in the same easy, descriptive style, which constitutes one of the chief excellencies of the author. The theme is the most noble one: The Wonderful Counsellor, the Light and Life of men. No uninspired pen could do it justice. If one can contribute nothing new on such a subject, it is pleasant to read

what shall be written "touching the King," when the "heart is inditing a good matter," and the words are traced by "the pen of a ready writer."

---

6. *Words of Wisdom Illustrated and Applied.* Being a Sequel to "Little Words." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 285, 16mo.

Pleasant stories pleasantly told, full of instruction and counsel, which we hope our youthful readers will ponder and heed.

---

7. *Cares and Comforts; by the Author of Lame Letty.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chestnut street, Philadelphia. pp. 190, 16mo.

No child could read this capital story without the deepest interest. The author shows how the cares of this life may become comforts, by the influence of religion on the soul. We see its blessed effects here on the lambs of the flock. And the way of salvation is made quite plain in the history of "Little Ruth and her brother Sammy."

The Child's Mission. By Mrs. Sarah S. T. Wallace. pp. 44, 16mo.

Remarkable Escapes from Peril. pp. 308, 16mo.

A Mother's Prayers Answered. pp. 190, 16mo.

Marion Leslie: or, the Light of Home. With an Introduction by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D. D. pp. 295, 16mo.

Mackerel Will. By the author of "Gilbert Gresham," etc. pp. 190, 16mo.

These volumes fully warrant the favorable opinion we have already repeatedly expressed of the valuable "Series for Youth," issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, of which they form the continuation.

---

8. *The New Parasol, and other Books for the Young Children.* American Tract Society.

This is a nice little volume, in 24mo., full of pleasing and interesting narratives, taken both from the Bible and from life. The Parables of our Saviour are explained in a manner suited to the "least and lowest." Also, a description is given, in a condensed form, of the manners, religion, and geographical position of all the heathen countries, calculated to arouse in the minds of the children a desire to send to the benighted heathen the "Lamp of Life," and to have the lost sheep brought back into the fold.

---

9. *Blind Bartimeus: or, the Story of a Sightless Sinner, and his Great Physician.* By Rev. WILLIAM J. HOGE, D. D. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 257, 18mo.

This admirable little work has been noticed by us before. It contains many instructive lessons, both for the converted and the unconverted. It points the believer to holiness, to duty, and to God; and points the unbeliever to a Saviour. All the barriers which the sinner has built up to shield himself from the darts of conscience, it throws down, and so leaves him bereft of his mock humility.

Then it shows him that Jesus is sufficient for all sinners, as well as that His grace alone can save.

An account is given of Blind Bartimeus, and a comparison drawn between his condition and that of the sinner, blinded by sin, and then healed by the Saviour's touch.

The book opens with the narrative as recounted by the three Evangelists, with some remarks of the author, by way of reconciling the seeming contradictions in the several accounts.

---

10. *Marcia and Ellen, the Drunkard's Children.* By Mrs. M. J. P. S. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 126, 18mo.

This is a very interesting little work, founded on fact. The story is told in a simple and easy style, which will not fail to please our little readers. The awful consequences of intemperance are depicted in a very striking manner, and the powerful influence of trust in God is shown in the history of the two young heroines.

---

11. *The Flower Boy of the Prairie.* American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 102, 18mo.

The hero of this story presents a model to all boys, and his history is very attractive. It is an account of one of the families of the earliest settlers of the Western States, and bears the additional charm of its main facts being well authenticated.

---

12. *Sketches from the History of Jericho, in Illustration of the Power of Faith.* American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. pp. 106, 18mo.

This volume is designed to illustrate the power of faith. It is got up in a very attractive form. An interesting biog-

raphy of a number of the Bible heroes may be gleaned from its pages, in connection with the history of that far-famed city. We recommend it to the large as well as the small children.

---

13. *The Rocket.* American Tract Society. pp. 118, 16mo.

A most interesting account of the origin of railways and locomotives; and of George and Robert Stephenson, father and son, the wonderful engineers who were chiefly instrumental in bringing them to their present perfection, and introducing them into common use. Let all the boys and girls get it and read it.

How the Tract Society came to publish it, we can not tell. It is no more *religious* than a narrative of engineering skill might be expected to be; and the few pages from a Sabbath Manual tacked to it at the close, to supply the felt defect, do not mend the matter.

The Jail-Bird, etc. American Tract Society. pp. 128, 16mo.

May Coverly. American Tract Society. pp. 224, 16mo.

---

14. *Coins, Medals, and Seals, Ancient and Modern: Illustrated and Described.* Edited by W. C. PRIME, Author of "Boat Life in Egypt and Nubia," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 292.

This is a beautifully printed volume, on tinted paper; and is well fitted to meet the editor's design. It is his "desire to encourage in the young a taste for numismatic study, and to discourage the folly of collecting worthless pieces of metal, whose sole value is in their scarcity, and

on which so much time and money have been expended." He sets out with a brief sketch of the origin of coins, and the progress in the art of coinage among ancient and modern nations. A large portion of the work is properly devoted to American coins, of which numerous representations are given. Many valuable hints are offered to young collectors, with price lists of English and American coins; the latter being quite full, descending even to election medals, political tokens, and temperance and tobacco medallets. The distinctive value of the volume rests upon the portion devoted to American numismatics and the well-executed illustrations, amounting to several hundred, which will be especially useful to those who have not access to large and well-arranged collections. The remainder appears to be chiefly taken from H. NOEL HUMPHREY'S excellent Coin Collector's Manual.

---

15. *The Children's Picture-Book of Quadrupeds and other Mammalia.* Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 276, square 16mo.

The title sufficiently indicates the character of this book. It is a vast improvement on works of the same kind which we read in our boyish days, most of which we have been obliged carefully and laboriously to forget. The scientific details in this are reliable, and are suitably relieved by anecdote, so as to keep alive the attention of the young reader.

---

16. *The Children's Bible Picture-Book.* Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 321, square 16mo.

We would not hesitate to commend this volume, also, if it were not for the pictures. These ought, surely, either to gratify the love of the beautiful, or cultivate the taste,

or convey useful knowledge; but in this case, very few of them can be regarded as accomplishing any one of these objects. Some of the originals, of which these are copies (?), are among the finest works of art in existence; but we look in vain for aught to remind us of their beauty here. See, for example, the mangled distortion of Da Vinci's *Last Supper*, not to mention others. As to the instruction they may afford, we would rather not teach our children to look upon a figure bearing a mediæval banner as a truthful representation of Christ when He appeared to Mary; or upon a monk with shaven crown as a picture of the Martyr Stephen. Many of the other engravings are even more objectionable than these. Both this volume and the last are admirably printed, on tinted paper.

---

17 *Stories of Rainbow and Lucky.* By JACOB ABBOTT. Harper & Brothers. 1861; pp. 192, 16mo.

Rainbow is a negro boy, and Lucky, his intelligent horse. The design of the tale is to exhibit the benefits we would derive from social equality with the negro. Rainbow is an angel, as the negro always is to such pseudo-philanthropists as Jacob Abbott. The book presents the most degrading type of abolitionism.

ARTICLE VII.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

I. AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEWS.—CONTENTS.

I. *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, April, 1861: Edited by Benj. J. Wallace and others. Article I. The Gallican Church. II. City Churches. III. The Imprecatory Psalms. IV. Philological Examination of Isaiah VI., 9, 10. V. The Sceptre of Judah. VI. The Relation of the Church to Reforms. VII. The Arrow-Headed Inscriptions. VIII. Motley's History of the Netherlands. IX. Literary and Theological Intelligence—1. England. 2. France. 3. Germany. X. Notices of New Books.

II. *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, April, 1861: Edited by Chas. Hodge, D. D. Article I. The Physical Training of Students. II. The Mode of Baptism III. Covenant Education. IV. Rawlinson's Herodotus. V. The Apostolic Benediction. VI. The Church and the Country. Short Notices.

III. *Evangelical Review*, April, 1861: Article I. The Ministerium Question. II. Baccalaureate Address. III. The Work of the Education Society. IV. The Lord's Prayer. V. List of Publications by Lutherans in the United States. VI. Emmaus Orphan House. VII. A Proposed Plan for a General Union of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, etc. VIII. Exposition of II. Peter 3 : 12. IX. Notices of New Publications.

IV. *Christian Review*, April, 1861: E. G. Robinson, Editor. Article I. Archetypes. II. The Greek Church. III. The Inspiration of the Apostles. IV. The New Trial of the Sinner. V. Conant's Matthew. VI. Immateriality of the Soul. VII. Berkeley and his Works. VIII. Notices of Recent Publications. Theological and Literary Intelligence.

V. *Theological and Literary Journal*, April, 1861: Edited by David N. Lord. Article I. The Handwriting on the Wall, Daniel V. II. The Autobiography of A. Carlisle, D. D. III. Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters LXIV., LXV., and LXVI. IV. The Sense of ὅπως ἂν, Acts III. 19. V. The Benefits of a Knowledge of the Purposes God has Revealed in Respect to His Kingdom. VI. Pontius Pilate. VII. Indications that the Sedimentary Strata were formed Simultaneously, not in Succession. VIII. R. F. Burton's Travels in the Lake Regions of Africa. IX. The Lessons Taught by the late Extraordinary Political Events, and the Catastrophes to which they are Tending. X. The Study of the Prophetic Scriptures Specially a Duty at the Present Time. XI. Literary and Critical Notices.

VI. *New Englander*, April, 1861: Article I. The Lives of the Haldanes, as illustrating the Rise of Congregationalism in Scotland. II. The Present Attitude of the Church toward Critical and Scientific Inquiry. III. The Acquisition of the Amoor. IV. Missions in India. V. Motley's United Netherlands. VI. The Pulpit. VII. Guizot's General History of Civilization. VIII. George Müller and the Life of Trust. IX. The Martyrs under Queen Elizabeth. X. Dr. Bushnell's Christian Nurture. XI Ralph Waldo Emerson on the Conduct of Life. XII. Notices of Books.

VII. *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, April, 1861: Article I. The Conflict of Modern Philosophy. II. Thomas Carlyle. III. Thomas Babington Macaulay. IV. Nast's Commentary. V. Methodism in Canada. VI. Philological Study of the Latin Language. VII. Lady Maxwell. VIII. Baptism and Church-Membership of Children. IX. Brief Reviews. X. Notes and Correspondence. XI. Repertory.

VIII. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, 1861: D. D. Whedon, D. D., Editor. The Order of Nature and Miracles. Atmospheric and Oceanic Currents. Buddhism: Its Origin and Results. Old Mackinaw. The Pauline use of the Word σάρξ as it Applies to the Doctrine of Depravity. The English Language. M'Cosh on the Intuitions. Barth's Northern and Central Africa. The State of the Country. Foreign Religious Intelligence. Foreign Literary Intelligence. Synopsis of the Quarterlies. Quarterly Book Table.

IX. *DeBow's Review*, July, 1861: Article I. The Times and the War. II. The Constitution of the Confederate States. III. Our Position and that of our Enemies. IV. The Future of our Confederation. V. Chapters from an Unpublished Novel. VI. Sea-Coast Defences. VII. The Path of Disunion. VIII. The Belligerents. IX. Modern Warfare. X. The Southern Confederacy. Department of Commerce. Miscellany. Editorial.

X. *American Theological Review*, April, 1861: Edited by Rev. Henry B. Smith, D. D. Article I. Annihilation. II. Slavery among the Ancient Hebrews. III. Rothe's Address on Philip Melancthon. IV. The Old Testament in the New. V. Christian Zeal. VI. The New Latitudinarians of England. VII. The Sinaitic Manuscript. Theological and Literary Intelligence. Literary and Critical Notices of Books. News of the Churches and of Missions.

XI. *Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository*, April, 1861: Edited by Edwards A. Park and Samuel H. Taylor. Article I. The Cross in Nature and Nature in the Cross. II. The Necessity of the Atonement. III. *Epistola ad Rusticum Apologetica.* IV. Speculation and the Bible. V. Exposition of Zechariah XIV. VI. The Salvation of Infants. VII. The Genealogy of Christ. VIII. Editorial Correspondence. IX. Notices of New Publications.

XII. *Pacific Expositor*, May, 1861: Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D., Editor. The Centurion of Cesarea. An Efficient Ministry. The Launch, and Life Machinery. The Princeton Review. Across the River. Presbytery of California—Report on the State of Religion. Training of Youth in California. Are all the Churches to divide? Horrors of Civil War. Attacks upon the Expositor. Mercantile Library of San Francisco. Rev. Dr. Phelps. State of the Country. Rev. Wilson Blain. Brainwork office. "Spoiling for a Fight." Miscellaneous Notices. Rev. N. B. Klink. Rev. John Hall—Religious Liberty—Christian Advocate—Every Little Helps—Apology. Fine Opportunities Offered. The Dormitory System. The Ancient Classics. Rev. Dr. Murray—The City College. The Presbyterian Sunday School Visitor. Prize Premium. Notices of New Books.

XIII. *Southern Episcopalian*, May, 1861: Edited by Rev. C. P. Gadsden and Rev. J. H. Elliott. Miscellaneous. Poetry. Editorial and Critical.

II. BRITISH PERIODICALS.

I. *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1861: Article I. Dixon's Personal History of Lord Bacon. II. The Republic of Andorre. III. Political Diaries. IV. Eton College. V. Remains of Alexis de Tocqueville. VI. Essays

and Reviews. VII. Autobiography and Letters of Mrs. Piozzi. VIII. The Fables of Babrius. IX. Forbes's Iceland. X. Election of President Lincoln and its Consequences.

II. *London Quarterly Review*, April, 1861: Article I. The Pearls and Mock Pearls of History. II. Euphuism. III. Lord Dundonald. IV. Spiritual Destitution in the Metropolis. V. German, Flemish, and Dutch Art. VI. African Discovery. VII. Lord Stanhope's Life of Pitt. VIII. Indian Currency, Finance, and Legislation. IX. Iron Manufacture.

III. *Westminster Review*, April, 1861: Article I. Mr. Kingsley on the Study of History. II. The Sicilian Revolution. III. Voltaire's Romances and their Moral. IV. The Universities and Scientific Education. V. Early Intercourse of England and Germany. VI. The Cotton Manufacture. VII. Maine on Ancient Law. VIII. Eton. IX. Austria and her Reforms. X. Contemporary Literature.

IV. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, May, 1861: The Ministry and the Budget. Mrs. Beauchamp's Vengeance. Motley's History of the Netherlands. The Euthanasia of the Ottoman Empire. The Executor. The Origin of Species—A New Song. Life of the Right Hon. William Pitt, by Earl Stanhope.

III. FRENCH PERIODICALS.

I. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Mars, 1861: Paris. I. Valvèdre, première partie, par M. George Sand. II. L'Atelier de Phidias, Étude tirée de l'Antique, par M Beulé, de l'Institut. III. L'Expédition de Garibaldi dans les Deux-Siciles, Souvenirs et Impressions personnelles.—I.—La Sicile, par M. Maxime Du Camp. IV. L'Agitation Allemande et le Danemark, par M. A Geffroy. V. De Exploitation de la Propriété Foncière et de la Vie Rurale en France, par M. L. Villermé. VII. Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme.—Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—VII.—Les Théories Polygénistes, le Croisement des Groupes Humains, par M. A. de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. VI. Les Shikarees, Chasses dans l'Inde, Entretiens Cynégétiques du Captaine Henri Shakspeare. VIII. Poésie.—Le Rêve d'une Reine d'Asie, par M. André Lefèvre. IX. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Essais et Notices.—Affaires de Pologne, par M Saint-Marc Girardin. XI. Affaires d'Espagne et le Ministère O'Donnell, par M. Ch. de Mazade. XII. Bulletin Bibliographique.

II. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er Avril, 1861: Paris. I. Valvèdre, seconde partie, par M. George Sand. II. La Californie en 1860, ses Progrès et sa Transformation, par M. L. Simonin. III. L'Expédition de Garibaldi dans les Deux-Siciles, Souvenirs et Impressions personnelles.—II.—Les Calabres, par M. Maxime Du Camp. IV. Histoire Naturelle de l'Homme. —Unité de l'Espèce Humaine.—VIII.—Les Théories Polygénistes et M. Agassiz, dernière partie, par M. A de Quatrefages, de l'Académie des Sciences. V. La Politique du Libre Échange.—I.—Transformation Économique de l'Angleterre, par M. André Cochut. VI. Les Suffrances d'un Penseur Italien.—Leopardi et sa Correspondance, par M. Charles de Mazade. VII. Les Voyageurs en Orient.—VIII.—Des Turcs et de la Condition des Chrétiens en Turquie d'après une Enquête confidentielle du Gouvernement Anglais, par M. Saint-Marc Girardin, de l'Académie Française. VIII. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. IX. Revue Musicale.—Le *Tannhauser* de M. Richard Wagner, par M. P. Scudo. X. Essais et Notices.—Le Système Pénitentiaire Irlandais. Bulletin Bibliographique.

III. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15 Avril, 1861: Paris. I. Les Peintres Flamands et Hollandais en Flandre et en Hollande.—Rembrandt et Van der

Helst, les Hollandais, par M. L. Vitet, de l'Académie Française. II. l'Outrage du 4 Janvier 1642, Histoire d'un Coup d'État avorté, d'après des Documens nouveaux, par. M. E.-D. Forgues. III. Valvèdre, troisième partie, par M. George Sand. IV. Le Mormonisme et les États-Unis, par M. Élisée Reclus. V. L'Expédition de Garibaldi dans les Deux-Siciles, Souvenirs et Impressions personnelles.—III.—Cosenza et la Basilicate, par M. Maxime Du Camp. VI. La Russie dans le Caucase.—II.—Les Peuples Montagnards, par M. E. Dulaurier. VII. L'Échelle Mobile devant le Corps Législatif, par M. L. de Lavergne, de l'Institut. VIII. La Littérature Nouvelle.—Des Caractères du Nouveau Roman, par M. Emile Montégut. IX. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire. X. Essais et Notices.—Le Progrès Agricole dans le Bocage, par M. Henri Proust. XI. Bulletin Bibliographique.

IV. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Mars, 1861: Paris. Sommaire: La Mission Évangelique et l'Italie. Marguerite de Valois, reine de Navarre. Bulletin Bibliographique. Revue du Mois—La question romaine.—Le dernier écrit du M. Louis Veuillot.—Le crise aux États-Unis; un discours du nouveau président.—La doctrine de Hegel appréciée par M. Schérer.—*L'Ouvrière*, par Jules Simon.

V. *Revue Chrétienne*, 15 Avril, 1861: Paris. Sommaire: Le Cantique des Cantiques. Marguerite de Valois. Bulletin Bibliographique.—*Voyage en Terre Sainte*, par F. Bovet. Revue du Mois.—La célébration de la passion et les mandements des évèques.—Condamnation de la civilisation moderne, par l'Encyclique papale. Un grand parti à prendre pour l'Eglise.—Publication des œuvres complètes de M. de Montalembert.—Progrès du véritable individualisme.—Réponse à quelques attaques.—Grave situation des Chrétiens de Syrie.

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XIV.—NO. 3.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXI.

ARTICLE I.

THE BATTLE OF FORT SUMTER: ITS MYSTERY AND MIRACLE—GOD'S MASTERY AND MERCY.

When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it.—Deut. 20 : 10, 12. Also, 2 Chron. 32 : 5–8; Ps. 22 : 7–9; Is. 25 : 11, 12; Num. 31 : 49; Is. 29 : 3, 4.

We have been called together to the sanctuary—the house of prayer, of promise, and of God's presence and powerful interposition—originally by the generally expressed sentiments of this community, and more recently by the unanimous voice of our Southern Congress, and the proclamation of the President of the Confederate States, and our own Government. Never was there a louder appeal, and never a more imperious necessity. We have been coerced into a war. It is a religious, and yet an irreligious and anti-Christian, war. We have crossed swords with the Northern confederacy over the Bible. We have met each other face to face at the same altar, invoked fire from heaven on each other, and appealed to the God of battles, to whom belongeth vengeance, to avenge us against our adversaries. The fearful guilt and amenability to the righteous judg-

ment of God is confidently transferred, by the judgment of each party, to the other, and Heaven's impartial tribunal appealed to for its infallible and inexorable verdict. The Word and providence of God are appealed to, with self-conviction, by both parties. This is a religious country, and religion is made to lend its sanction, and to consecrate the war as holy and sacred. This is a Christian land, and Christ is now entreated to send—not peace, but a sword. This is a Protestant nation, and yet liberty of conscience, of thought, and speech, and action, can be maintained by eleven sovereign States, and ten millions of its free-born citizens, only at the point of the bayonet, the edge of the sword, and the flash of dread artillery. This is a land of freedom, where thirty-four sovereign States or nationalities were united, by voluntary compact, in a constitutional confederacy, for the greater security of their individual sovereignty, by providing for the equal and impartial interest of each and all; and yet eleven of these can confederate together, under a similar compact, for the preservation of their own original and inherent rights, and the prevention of an ever-aggravating political controversy and national strife, by resisting unto blood, and conquering a peace, from some twenty States, and as many millions of professing republicans and Christians, now in arms to subjugate, enslave, or annihilate us.

All forms of religion, Jewish and Christian, and all forms of Christianity, Romish and Protestant, High Church and Low, are now found ranged side by side, under common leaders and common chaplains, and uniting in acts of common worship, praise and prayer.

What a spectacle to God, to angels, and to the world! What lamentation in heaven! What a jubilee in hell! What a triumph to despotism and infidelity! See how these Christians hate one another, and how Republicans, by a sectional majority, take the Government out of the hands of a million majority, and put it into the hands of a mil-

itary despotism; which sets aside the Supreme Court; tramples on the Constitution; ignores, and even opposes Congress; against all constitutional authority sets up Scott as a military dictator; calls for seventy-five thousand and accepts two hundred and fifty thousand troops; proclaims war; creates a self-chosen military Board to supercede State authorities; declares martial law; sets at defiance the fundamental right of *habeas corpus* and the decrees of Courts, even of the Supreme Court; abolishes trial by jury; not only raises armies, but orders their number and term of service, and compels them to take a test oath of allegiance; builds, purchases and hires ships of war; mans, equips, and gives them secret and peremptory orders; blockades ports of States still declared to be in the Union; divides such States into military districts; takes military possession of Maryland, against the declarations of her authorities; shoots down her citizens, forcibly seizes her arms, dwellings and property; imprisons her citizens without charge or trial; establishes a hostile camp commanding Baltimore, and opens the batteries of Fort McHenry on the city; takes military possession of St. Louis, and shoots down men, women and children in her streets; foments and aids civil war in Virginia, Kentucky, Texas, and Missouri; invades Virginia, and takes military possession of Hampton and Alexandria, where it brutally murders a peaceable citizen defending his own house, family and property against an infamous soldiery who were permitted to rob and pillage an unarmed and unresisting population, and to outrage helpless women; has destroyed public property in ships, buildings and forts, to an amount of some twenty millions of dollars, and involved the country, even in the period of a few months, in a loss of not less than one thousand millions of dollars; which has justified the cowardly assassination of a resident citizen of Washton, at the door of his own house, to which he had been summoned for the cold-blooded purpose of murder; hung,

without trial, a merchant of Hampton, Virginia, for shooting an officer who took forcible possession of his store and goods, and struck him in the face with his drawn sword; stripped a gentleman of the same town stark naked, and in that condition marched him as a prisoner to Fortress Monroe; destroyed crops and houses, and other property, in a single county, and in a single week, to the extent of five hundred thousand dollars; commended the retention of all fugitive slaves; attempted through a slave cook to poison the food of the soldiery; plots the assassination of President Davis; violated all the confidential sanctities of the telegraph and the post-office; established a reign of terror, by a system of espionage and threats, over men and women, over the press and free speech; and against all law, human and divine, is now proceeding, unless God prevent, to carry devastation throughout the South, until it is brought into prostrate subjection; who privateers, while proclaiming it to be piracy and worthy of death; and who employs mercenary foreign hirelings to invade, ravage, and destroy unarmed and unsuspecting towns of a neutral State, shooting its inhabitants, and barbarously trampling and kicking to death an infirm old man, eighty years of age.

All this, and more, has been done within the space of a few weeks. All this has been perpetrated, after the refusal of power, even by an almost exclusively *Republican Congress*, and without waiting for another, which is called only to ratify these acts, and prostrate themselves and the Constitution before the usurping despot, and while the Constitution, which Lincoln swore to "preserve, protect, and defend," neither authorizes *him nor Congress* to make war against a State, much less against eleven, and, we may say, fourteen States, such power having been expressly withheld by its framers, after full deliberation. Mr. Lincoln is, therefore, not only a usurper and a military despot, but a perjured traitor, as is now declared by the recent judg-

ment of Chief Justice Taney, who administered to him the above solemn oath, in the presence of multitudes, and before the righteous tribunal of Heaven's avenging justice. Military officers are permitted in Virginia to command the silence of the press; prisoners are detained at Washington who surrendered under protest against violated faith, and refused a hearing, although taken by a subordinate officer while preparing to evacuate Alexandria within the time agreed upon, under a flag of truce sent from the *Pawnee*, the commanding officer declaring that he knew of no agreement. This unscrupulous and audacious tyrant sanctions acts of military dictatorship which transcend the power of any monarch upon earth, and overwhelm in oblivious ruin *magna charta*, the bill of rights, *habeas corpus*, trial by jury, and every right for which Englishmen and our fathers have contended, unto blood, for ages past. Might now makes right, and unchained devils, with all the shameless passions of brutish beasts, are let loose to ravish and ravage, even neutral States. Not only at Alexandria, but at Hampton, are these rascalities perpetrated, and near Norfolk, a father was compelled to witness the brutal outrage of his own daughter, a young lady of sixteen years of age.

> "Oh, thou Almighty! awful and supreme!
> Redress, revenge an outraged nation's wrongs!
> Shower down your curses on the tyrant's head!
> Arise, the Judge, display your vengeance on him!"

Such, alas! is the opprobrious spectacle now exciting the contumely and ridicule of patriots, philanthropists and Christians throughout the world. The war upon the South now is, not to subject them to the Government and Union of the United States, as they existed, but to a new Government—without law or constitution—fanatical, remorseless and tyrannical.

To sustain us in encountering such a war, against such an enemy, we must be able to satisfy our conscience, from

God's Word, that we may properly pray for and expect God's powerful providence to be with us, to guide and govern our counsels, give efficiency to our plans, and valor and victory to our armies.

As to the rectitude of our defensive war, we propose to consider it hereafter, as the effort has been very extensively made, by clergymen at the North, to justify the aggressive war of the Northern Government, and to condemn ours as rebellious, and as exposed to the righteous and explicit condemnation of God.

On this occasion, we will restrict our argument, and your attention, to the glorious victory of Fort Sumter, considered, first, as a signal proof of the powerful providence of God; and, secondly, as a pledge and promise of God's continued providence and protection over us.

However minute and multiplied the wheels of human events, there is a Spirit that animates them, and a divine Redeemer who overrules and disposes all their revolutions to the accomplishment of His wise and preconcerted purposes. The government of this world of ours—sinful, chaotic and rebellious as it is—is upon His shoulder, and all power, over all flesh, is put into His hands. He supports all, permits all, restrains all, and limits all. He protects His friends, punishes His and their enemies, and rewards His people's confidence and services. Christ, however, thus regulates all things, not by direct and immediate control, but through the instrumentality of angels, who are sent forth as ministering spirits; by evil and lying spirits, who are permitted to delude His enemies; and of good and wicked men, who fulfill His purposes while pursuing their own ends.

Holy and pure, Christ makes these wheels "full of eyes," wisely and judiciously to work together for His glory and the good of His people. Supreme and sovereign, profound, inscrutable, irresistible, and infallible, He harmo-

nizes promises and providences, and providences with providences, in infinite wisdom, love, and power.

It is, therefore, a most clear and Christian duty to recognize, admire, and adore this providence; to observe it carefully; remember it gratefully; duly to appreciate it, and heartily and humbly to acknowledge it, not only in the thanksgiving of the lips, but also in the consecrated devotion of our living energies. Such recognition of providence will fill the heart with praise for the goodness and mercy manifested by the Lord our Redeemer in his innumerable interpositions for our preservation and deliverance. It will impart singular confidence in all future exigencies. It will secure Christ's continued presence and powerful aid, in answer to our prayers, and in conjunction with our efforts. It will inspire a sweet tranquillity, in reposing on Him who only maketh us to dwell in safety.

But if all this is true of ordinary providences, how much more is it true of such as are extraordinary. Extraordinary providences are instructive warnings, of great importance in God's government of the world, and to be very solemnly considered. "The voice of the Lord crieth out unto the city, and the men of wisdom shall see His name." "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" The true believer will ever say—"The Lord hath wrought all our works in and for us." Moses, by Divine direction, wrote a memorial of the victory over Amalek, as the result and reward of prayer, and built there an altar, with the inscription—"The Lord is my Banner." The Jews established the feast of Purim to commemorate their signal deliverance from Haman's purposed destruction, as "an anniversary throughout every generation, every family, every province, and every city, that those days of Purim should not fail from amongst the Jews, nor the memorial of them perish from their seed." Several Psalms are entitled "To Bring to Remembrance;" and

many of the names of places were mementoes of God's providences—as, Bethel, "the house of God;" Beer-la-hairoi, "the well of him that liveth and looketh on me." God also is called by titles which have the same moral purpose. He is called Jehovah Jireh, "the Lord will provide;" Jehovah Nissi, "the Lord is my banner;" Jehovah Shalom, "the Lord send peace;" Jehovah Shamruch, "the Lord is there;" Jehovah Zidkenu, "the Lord my righteousness;" and Ebenezer, "hitherto hath the Lord helped us." The Lord also assumes such titles to Himself, as, when he calls Himself "the Lord that brought Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees;" "the Lord that brought them out of Egypt;" "the Lord that gathered them out of the North country."

I.

We proceed, therefore, to establish the first position, and to show that in the events connected with the occupation, siege and fall of Fort Sumter, and the unconditional surrender of its garrison, we have a signal display of the powerful providence of God. The event is in every way wonderful, marvellous, and only not miraculous, though all the more stupendous, that all was accomplished by natural causes and human agency.

The fort itself is considered by General Scott as one of the strongest in the whole country. Mr. Russell compares it to Sevastopol. Major Anderson, and military men generally, have regarded it as commanding the whole harbor, and the city also. Mr. Russell is of opinion that no navy in the world could resist it, and that every fortification erected against it might easily have been destroyed.

It was, therefore, universally considered impregnable, and its reduction impossible, either by bombardment or assault, except at a fearful loss of life. It was repeatedly declared that the whole power of South Carolina could not conquer Fort Sumter in forty-five weeks, and that it would

annihilate and silence all our batteries in an hour or two. This Major Anderson very foolishly published, on more than one occasion, and his officers also. It was, indeed, the belief he could shell and destroy our city.

Major Anderson expressed perfect assurance of his ability to consummate these threats to his Government; declared that to do so he required no reinforcement or supplies; and warned our authorities against the fatal and suicidal policy they were pursuing. Mr. Russell says: "He held all our fortifications in professional contempt;" and he declared he only required an hour to silence them every one.

After examination, it was the reported opinion of General Beauregard that the fort could be taken by bombardment, but that it was a work of time; and that an assault, if not impracticable, was both highly dangerous and doubtful. In this view Major Ripley had previously concurred.

The facts fully justify these views. A parapet sixty feet high, with the largest kind of guns *en barbette*, commanded vertically every interior position and movement of his opponents, while the remainder, of seventy-five guns, swept the horizon within twelve-feet thick walls and the most impregnable casemates. To man these guns and mortars, he had one hundred and nine men, who actually worked them. For three months he was busy in strengthening the walls, closing up the entrance and port-holes, preparing loop-holes for sharp-shooters, and grenades and rocks for assault; in undermining the wharf, and arranging interior guns so as to sweep the entrance, and traverses for the protection of his barbette guns. It was, also, confidently asserted by Northern papers that he had been amply reinforced, and supplied with all kinds of stores, and if he wanted—as Mr. Russell, on the very doubtful testimony of Doubleday (or Foster), affirms—requisite instruments for sighting his guns, it was not for want of opportunity to bring them with him when he first dishonorably entered

the fort, with two ship-loads of materials, provisions and drink, selected by himself; nor because any principle of honor prevented him from forming secret plots with Mr. Fox, and other emissaries of Lincoln, who, under false and treacherous disguises, were permitted to visit him, for his reinforcement and the destruction or subjugation of those who were relying on his honor, and supplying, with liberal hand, not only his wants, but luxuries, also. Besides, to counterbalance any such disadvantages, Major Anderson had long practical experience as a teacher and author of practical gunnery, having been the instructor of General Beauregard himself; having for months drilled and practiced his men, and having provided for each gun carefully written instructions, besides the marks referred to by Mr. Russell.

Major Anderson had pledges, also, of coöperation and reinforcement as soon as hostilities commenced. And when he refused to surrender, he knew that a fleet of five vessels, with six thousand troops, muffled boats and oars, and every possible preparation for landing cavalry, and infantry, and flying artillery, were due at our harbor on April 11th or 12th, and he saw them within hailing distance during the whole time of the engagement. Indeed, I could plainly see them, in company with thousands of others, from the Battery, while a favorable wind, clear sky, the signals from the fort, and the sympathies and loud imprecations of every spectator, invited and urged their approach.

To meet this fleet, some six or seven thousand men were posted at various convenient positions on the islands, as if to point out the best landing-places, and welcome them with warm and very substantial salutations; while not more than two hundred and fifty men manned the batteries which were actually employed against Fort Sumter, and these almost entirely raw and inexperienced, and with no other protection than the contemptuously despised and

hastily extemporized batteries. Two of the most prominent of these were, moreover, very generally considered to be mere slaughter-pens.

The taking of Fort Sumter had been, for months, the subject of universal thought, conversation and planning, and had awakened increasing solicitude and doubt as to its practicability, except by the fearfully destructive method of assault. Even after the firing of Friday was over, this opinion was generally expressed among the crowd, many of whom were ready and eager to join in an assault, which was projected by the citizens, if permitted by the military authorities. It was on Saturday morning, April 14th, that four thirty-two pounders *en barbette* were put up in presence of the crowd on the Battery, in addition to five twenty-four pounders already in position, with ammunition and every needful appliance at hand, and manned by the Citadel Cadets, who were in camp on the Battery Green, with lines formed and sentries on duty. This evinced that the enemy most dreaded was the fleet, and that the post of greatest and of reliably anticipated danger, and of most honorable exposure, was designedly held by such companies as the Washington Light Infantry, the South Carolina College Cadets, the Zouaves—each largely and most conspicuously represented by members of this congregation—and by similarly exposed companies on Morris Island and its inlets.

The hazardous magnitude of the enterprise of encountering Fort Sumter, under all the circumstances detailed, is demonstrated by the views expressed since the event throughout this country and Europe. It has been regarded as without a parallel, and incredible, that such an arduous achievement should have been accomplished without loss of life. The course pursued by critics has, therefore, been, universally, either to diminish its importance by denying the strength of the fort and of Major Anderson's position, or to deny the truthfulness of our reports. And hence, to this very day, various witnesses are found testifying to the fact

of some thousand men having been killed, including Gen. Beauregard. A telegraph was actually read, amid a tumult of acclamation, from his pulpit, by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, to the effect that Fort Moultrie was dismantled, every other battery silenced, a great number killed, and the fleet inside the harbor.

Now, this incredulity was perfectly natural and necessary. It was fully shared in by every inhabitant of Charleston and of the South. Among the spectators who listened to the confused noise and shouts of the battle, who saw the white smoke rising from the cannon's mouth at every fateful discharge, who heard their deep and awful roar, sounding as if issuing from the belly of hell, belching forth fire and smoke, and forming a sulphurous canopy of death over the field of strife, and who followed in their course the red-hot shell streaking the atmosphere with a trail of hissing fire, and when they burst, discharging their destructive missiles with accumulated violence—every spectator, we say, of these sights felt in every ball a sympathetic pang of agony, and anxiously and tearfully—and some on their knees, by fasting and prayer, pleading for the life of loved ones exposed to the fearful hail-storm of shell and bullets—awaited the tidings of certain and extensive fatality. And when, from hour to hour, through Friday and Saturday, tidings were received that nobody was seriously injured, and when, after the flag was a second time lowered, and the white flag took its place, and the fort was surrendered, and the smoke of battle cleared away, and the thunder of artillery had died into silence deep as death, and the first wild burst of universal gratulation and acclaim had subsided into solemn seriousness, and it was authoritatively made known that not a single individual was killed, and crowds of living men were seen walking on the parapets and around the fort of Sumter, a thrill of grateful delight ran through every heart. Eyes unused to weep were filled with tears. Tongues unaccustomed to pray or praise were vocal with thanksgiving

to God, to whom alone belonged the miracle and the mercy of such an unparalleled deliverance. "I seldom go to Church," said a gentleman, "and have no religion, but I do recognize God's providence in this event, and thank Him for this glorious victory." When the bells began to peal, a lady in a carriage exclaimed that she hoped every bell in the city would ring out plaudits for our brave soldiers. "Madam," said a gentleman within hearing, "I hope they will ring until they call us all to the house of God, there to humble ourselves before Him, and acknowledge that this is the Lord's doings, and that it is marvellous in our eyes."

But this event is remarkable, and beyond all precedent, in its political effect upon the country. It aroused, and concentrated in union with the destinies of the South, the great hearts of Virginia and of Tennessee. It cemented into one living mass of patriotic ardor every Southern spirit, however previously divided. Nor was its effect less wonderful upon the distracted and hostile parties at the North. Every gun fired against Sumter was oratorically represented as aimed at the life of the nation, and the unconditional surrender of the flag and fort was considered as a dishonor, to be wiped out only by the subjugation or extermination of the South, the demolition of Charleston, and the reduction of South Carolina to a barren and uninhabited wilderness, sown with salt, and over which the foot of man shall never pass. "The war having begun at Charleston, must end at Charleston, and it must be the bitter end of Charleston."

Now, while the fact of a united North, the call for seventy-five thousand troops, the declaration of war, and whirlwind preparations for war against the South, are incontrovertible as consequent upon Sumter's fall, there is no rational connection between the fall of Sumter and the consolidation of the North in support of a military despotism, and in the usurpation of all the powers of the

Constitution, of the Supreme Court, of Congress, of the States, of the judiciary, and of every power, human and divine, and in a lawless, unchristian, inhuman, and barbarously wicked and licentious irruption of mercenary vandals upon the South.

The life of the United States was no more, nor in any degree as much affected, as that of Great Britain after the separation from her of this very North. The life of the United States is in each sovereign State, and in the consenting union of as many States as may agree to combine together for their mutual safety and welfare. At first, nine States thus united—then thirteen, and, from time to time, one sovereign State after another. And it is simply ridiculous to say that a union which consists of no fixed number of States, which refused to assume a national name, which expressly limited the union, withheld any power to interfere with or prevent the future separation and secession of any State as a coequal sovereign, and which reserved to each State all the powers not expressly delegated—that such a union is lost by the withdrawal of ten or eleven States out of thirty-four.

As to the flag being insulted, about which there has been such a flutter of new-fledged "spread-eagleism," we challenge the production of a case in modern history in which such chivalrous respect was shown to an absolutely helpless enemy, in danger of momentary explosion, and to his flag, which had for months flaunted defiance in our faces, and which he was permitted both to salute and to carry with him to the North, that by its help his vaulting ambition might overleap itself, and, after playing fantastic tricks before high heaven and the swarming myrmidons of usurping despotism, take at its crisis that wave of fortune that might lead him on to an inglorious and bad preëminence.

And as to our alleged aggression and initiation of the war, the charge is equally puerile and self-contradictory. "The first act of war was committed by the Government

of Washington against South Carolina, when fortresses, intended lawfully only for her protection, were *armed for her subjugation.* That act of war was repeated, when armed preparations were twice made to reinforce these means of her oppression. It was repeated, when she was formally notified that these means of her oppression would be strengthened, 'peaceably, if they could be; forcibly, if they must.' And it was only, then, after a magnanimous forbearance, little expected of her ardent nature, that she proceeded to what was *an act of strict self-defence,* the reduction of Fort Sumter."

The attack on Sumter was, therefore, the last link in a chain of events, beginning with the unauthorized and timid treachery of Major Anderson, which was itself a declaration of warlike aggression, and continued in all the acts of tortuous duplicity and threatening of an insolent Government, during which provocation was followed by patience, until South Carolina was abused as a cowardly braggart, and nothing was left her but submission to the forging around her limbs of the chains of a despotic tyranny, or an appeal to arms.

The further charge, of adding robbery to resistance, is insufferably false. By the Constitution, no fort could be erected within the territory of a State, except by its permission. But if not erected, how could it be held, against its wishes and interests? And was not the forcible seizure and holding of Sumter, on a war footing, ready for instant assault, and with powerful guns frowning defiance and destruction to our chief city, a most arbitrary usurpation of authority? Three-fourths of all its cost, and equipment, and maintenance, had been borne by the South, and the faith and honor of South Carolina, and of the Confederate States, were pledged to meet all equitable demands for it, and for all other property which had pertained to the United States in common. And with what face can this usurping North talk of honesty and good faith, while it

grabs, and holds by military force, all the forts, arsenals, mints, navy yards, buildings, territories, and treasures, not only within the non-seceding States, but also, as far as possible, within the Southern States, and which now holds by military domination the State of Maryland and portions of Virginia, Missouri and Kentucky, destroying property and lives, and shooting down, hanging, and imprisoning peaceable citizens, who defend their property and denounce lawless robbery?

No! the fall of Sumter sealed the declaration of Southern independence; united eleven Southern States; established free trade and Southern manufactures, commerce, literature, and social organization; created a new empire on the earth; turned from the North the overflowing stream of wealth that had enriched and exalted her; and arrested in its irrepressible conflict the fanatical, unholy, and atheistic crusade against God's Word and providence, and the vital institutions of the South, which the Republican party and the present administration are pledged to consummate. Hence the pride, passion, and desperate fury, which, under the plea of patriotism and defence of the Government, threatens to pour twenty millions of Goths and Vandals, and mercenary hirelings, and with an ocean's might sweep before its irresistible deluge every living inhabitant of the South.

The victory of Sumter derives its greatest importance from this developement of the real *animus* of the North. The Government must be consolidated. The South must be subjugated. The majority must govern. The sovereignty and reserved rights of States must be branded as monstrous fabrications. New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, must be sustained in growing magnificence, and, therefore, bounties on Northern fisheries, navigation laws, protection by tariff for every Northern interest, exclusion of the South from all benefits of foreign competition, postal arrangements, territorial aggrandize-

ment, must be maintained. And to secure this, the Constitution must be set aside, the Supreme Court ignored, Congress set at naught, and only convened when military despotism is established, and all liberty of speech and action, and all the rights of freemen, are abolished, and mobs, or self-constituted boards, or military courts, determine rights and decree justice, and decide for life or death, and displace courts of justice, and all law and equity—in other words, to give the sanction of a coerced rump parliament to the decrees and doings of an unprincipled Government, which is itself confessedly governed by the Black Republican party.

To this despotism democracy, conservatism, anti-abolitionism, and even Christianity, are all subjected. The pulpit, the Bible, the Church, the college, the seminary, the religious press, the courts of the Church, are all made subservient, and with sacrilegious impiety bow the knee to that golden image set up by the American Nebuchadnezzar; while the star-spangled banner takes the place of the cross, covers the communion table, and is sung as a doxology in the Church, the prayer meeting, and the theological seminary commencement, and waves over God's sanctuaries.

Thus has Sumter opened the eyes of the North, like those of Adam and Eve, to see good in evil, and evil in good, to see "a holy and sacred war," which "God knows to be right," in a diabolical and unnatural invasion of sovereign States, which is in violent conflict with every provision of the Constitution, as it is against every dictate of reason, humanity and religion; and to see in the Lincoln dictatorship "the Government of the United States and the ordinance of God," which is to be obeyed at the peril of "damnation"—while its own advocates admit it has "set aside the Constitution," and has no more lawful or constitutional authority to do what it is doing than the Emperor of Russia or of China.

But Sumter has also opened the eyes of the South, to see that the soul of the Northern confederacy was consolidated despotism—the many-headed monster of a blind, heartless and unprincipled majority—to which constitutions, laws, honesty and honor were ropes of sand, or as the cords with which Samson was bound; that conservative and Christian men at the North, if not in heart in unison with it, were impotent against it, and that she must now or never redeem, regenerate, and disenthral herself from a despotism worse than any other, because, under form of law, it could make laws, alter the Constitution, and subject to its will every guard against unlimited tyranny, and every guarantee of individual liberty. The South has *dared* to *assert* her independence. But the sleeping lion is now rampant, and has sprung upon her. His eyes glare perdition. His claws are in her sides. His appetite for blood is now whetted. His horrid teeth stare frightfully from his opened jaws, and we are in the death struggle for liberty.

But again: Sumter has also opened the eyes of Europe to the true character and purposes of the Northern usurpation, and its attempted subjugation of the South; to her hypocrisy; to her aggressions; to her perfidy; to her selfish sectional aggrandizement; to her greedy, grasping monopoly of trade and commerce; and her reduction of the South to a mere tributary province, from which she might derive an increasing annual tribute of hundreds of millions of dollars. The North has lost character and caste. She has sunk already from a first to a third-rate power. She is snubbed and stricken in the face, and her policy dictated to her. She is forsaken, denounced and despised, and, under the intolerable affectation of pity, she is reproved, repudiated and defied, by British, French, and Spanish navies, now tracking her desperate course. Nor has the conduct of our Southern Government, in relation to Sumter, been less powerful in leading Europe to a conviction and recognition of our determination and ability as a belligerent power; as

authorized to issue letters of marque; as having displayed signal wisdom, energy, and moderation; as entitled to a peaceful separation and prompt recognition; as the victim of Northern rapacity and aggression; as invincible in a defensive war, and certain of ultimate triumph; and as having been driven into this war for self-preservation.

The fall of Sumter was, therefore, an event of vast proportions, in *itself* considered, requiring some twenty-four batteries to reduce it and repress the fleet; requiring some seven thousand men to man these batteries, and meet the shock of an invading army, and the guns of an assembled fleet. Two thousand balls, from twenty-four to forty-two pounders, during two memorable days, Friday and Saturday, were hurled from monstrous cannon, with scientific skill and deadly purpose. The fire from Sumter was desperately aimed at life, as is evident from Major Anderson's continued incredulity as to the humiliating defeat of all his proclamations and prophecies, and by the perfect aimlessness of many of his balls, but as designed for men, and not for *merlons*. And that, after all his efforts, and the malicious plans and purposes of Doubleday and Foster, not a single life should be lost nor limb fractured, is a most signal proof of the wonderful power of Divine providence, a mystery and a miracle of mercy; and when taken in connection with the world-wide results which must flow from it to the present and all future generations, the fall of Sumter, and the bloodless victory of South Carolina, after an outlay of nearly a million of dollars from her own treasury, and with exclusively South Carolina troops, is an event which must, to the end of time, occupy a brilliant page in the record of Carolina's glory, and the annals of the fame and achievements of our Confederate States.

II.

And wherefore, it must be now asked, has the omnipotent and omniscient God ordered and overruled this won-

derful providence? Nothing, most surely, of less consequence than the eventful victory would portend, and that is, a final separation from the North, in Church and State; an independent Southern Confederacy; a continued developement of that unparalleled problem of African Christianized civilization, and through it, of a community which for intellectual, political, commercial, and Christian progress, and for the necessary connection of its material interests—its great, world-commanding products of cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar, indigo, turpentine, tar, live oak, and hard pine, not to mention all other products, in grain, cattle, and breadstuffs, to which it is equally adapted—is without a rival in the history of the world. This is the manifest result, and as manifestly God's destiny. God's finger is seen writing in visible letters before our eyes, "The glory has departed—come out from among them, and be ye separate." The mystery of providence, long hidden, God has now made manifest, and the secret things that belonged unto Him, He has now revealed unto us and to our children. And the proof is: that God's providence is interpreted, and His will revealed, by His Word and working.

Now, the whole movement of the South is based upon God's Word, simply and sincerely interpreted, believed and obeyed, and upon the recognition of God's authority, power and providence, in forcing among us millions of laborers; in sanctioning and requiring their service; in providing for them a climate, soil, and seed and labor, adapted to them, and designed as a benefit and blessing to the world; in imposing upon us their superintendence and these cultures as a solemn trust for mankind at large; and in blessing our labors, in a marvellous manner, with all spiritual and temporal good.

Looking to God and to His Word, praying with all prayer for counsel and direction, giving earnest heed to the dictates of conscience, and guided by all the lights of past experience, and by all the probable issues of the future, the

South has unbounded confidence in interpreting the victory of Sumter as an earnest of God's continued presence, providence and power, with her counsellors, her armies, and her people. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant."

Begun in prayer and humiliation, and continued in private, and public, and national recognition of God, every step in this Southern movement has been pointed out by a voice from heaven, saying: "This is the way, walk ye in it," so that our very rashness, improvidence, and blind folly have been overruled, and made to work together for good. Both in what He has prevented, what He has perfected, and what accomplished, God's stately and majestic steppings are manifest, and it is impossible to look back upon the daring course of this little State, alone and unbefriended, and unprepared in any form or degree, challenging possession of this fort; ordering its reduction; throwing up its forts in the face of Sumter and its Government; firing, with only five rounds of ammunition, upon a vessel full of troops, with the guns of Sumter thrown out, and Doubleday on his knees pleading for permission to fire upon their sand-heap and unprotected soldiery; upon the kindled wrath and insolent message of the now valorous commander, and upon numberless incidents in the long period of daily unanticipated delays, deceptions, and plotted destruction, without admiring and adoring the conspicuous providence and protection of God.

The very first step taken by our Convention was to appoint Commissioners to negotiate, through the President, with Congress, for the possession of the forts in our harbor, as property to be held in honorable trust until finally and satisfactorily accounted for, while authoritative assurances were given to Major Anderson that no attack would be made upon Fort Moultrie, and he knew that such a thing as a mob never had existence in Charleston.

Notwithstanding these assurances, Major Anderson continued, with the most belligerent intent and activity, to fortify the fort in every way, both externally and internally, and reported it to be impregnable against any popular assault. He had also privately led to the belief that his purposes and feelings were peaceful and sympathetic. And yet, without cause, without orders, while reinforcements had been refused as unnecessary, and the arms in the arsenal were put under the protection of the State, and an officer who had attempted clandestinely to remove them was withdrawn, Major Anderson, by a strategetic nocturnal movement, which can only be justified from the charge of cowardly distrust in himself and the honor of this State, as a necessary act of war, spiked the guns, and burnt their carriages and other property, and transferred whatever was available to Fort Sumter, over which he raised the flag of Fort Moultrie, which was afterwards lowered for the sign of surrender, and proceeded to put it into a condition impregnable against any attack possible by us. This act of war the Government disclaimed, and yet approved, and in so doing made a declaration of war against South Carolina, as plain and formidable as words and actions could do it.

This declaration of war was confirmed by the treatment of our Commissioners, and of our subsequent Commissioner, and of the members of Congress, who assured him, from the President, that no attempt would be made to reinforce, or to attack the fort, at the very moment that the *Star of the West* was secretly, and with the most furtive and false representations, sent, with two hundred and fifty armed men, to Fort Sumter, under cover of being a merchant steamer. Will any man, in his senses, deny that this was another act of deceptive hostility, only to be justified by a state of *open* and *malignant* war? Surely, it was an act of *mean*, *dastardly*, and *dishonorable* war, under the professions of peace and a flag of truce. And who can avoid recognizing the presence and providence of God with us, in the

knowledge, some how obtained by friends in Washington or New York, in time to give us warning on the night before her arrival, and in the efficiency given to a partial battery, with only five rounds of ammunition? And what will those moon-eyed patriots of the North, who try to skulk from the everlasting infamy of forcing this war upon this country, in this age, amid these Churches, and under institutions based upon the consent of the governed, and securing to every State sovereignty and self-government and the consequent right to remain in, or to remove out of, the Union they had voluntary formed—what will they say to the storm of denunciated vengeance which swept over South Carolina, the numberless plans concocted for the reinforcement of Sumter and Pickens, and the actual reinforcement of Pickens, Monroe, and Key West, the formidable and multiplied defences, and the presence of a powerful naval force? Say, ye gods who rule in Gotham—say, ye Goths and Vandals—was this war, or was it peace?

While Mr. Seward, by lying deceit, was filling the country with the assurance that Fort Sumter was to be evacuated; soothing our Commissioners with prospects of a peaceful evacuation, for weeks after an official refusal to hold any communication was written and withheld—while Mr. Seward authorized Judge Campbell, of the Supreme Court, to confirm our Commissioners in their views, and through them the authorities in Montgomery and Charleston—various messengers, with despatches, and under false pretences and names, visited the fort, and made observations and plans with Major Anderson (who was still enjoying our hospitalities), to reinforce with a powerful fleet, and, as it was said, six thousand men. Was this, which was all done in time of peace, war, and a dishonorable and perfidious war, or what was it? And the discovery of secret despatches, betraying the lying stratagem in time to expect and prepare to meet the fleet—was this second warning, like that given

to Esther, from God, or from the devil, or from our enemies? Who can doubt?

The secret correspondence, since published by Governor Pickens, and the annihilating letters of Mr. Harvey to the public and to the Secretary of War and President, prove incontestibly that the determined policy of peace was abandoned in order to arouse, by the sacrifice of Major Anderson and the provocation of an attack, the present war spirit at the North, and thus save the Republican party, and give a pretext for usurpation, despotism and bloodshed.

And yet, even then, though in a published letter Major Anderson had mercifully warned us, and threatened a fearful infliction, three separate overtures were made to him to evacuate at any time convenient to himself, and in the most honorable manner. This, in the perfect knowledge and confidence of immediate reinforcements from the fleet then more than due, he could, without any real bravery, boldly decline to do; for had the fleet been resolutely determined, at whatever loss, to do it, they might very possibly have succeeded. Was, then, his peremptory refusal to accept of any overtures of evacuation, and his declaration that if the United States flag was fired upon, he must fire—in other words, that as soon as the fleet commenced hostilities he must open his batteries upon us—was that, I ask, a declaration of war, or not?

Charleston, South Carolina, and the South, originated the battle of Sumter, and precipitated war? Hear it, O heavens, and be astonished, O earth! After months of conferences and compromises, in and out of Congress, rejected; after insult, tergiversation, deceit, promises and pledges broken, preparations for war amid professions of peace—after actual invasion and threatened destruction—was ever such long-suffering and patient forbearance manifested before—such willingness to believe treacherous foes, and hope against hope, and chivalrously feed and hearten, and then open the way for a helpless enemy, in his own time and

way, and with the honors of war, to unite himself to his confederates in arms, to concentrate and continue war upon us? Never! Nor would the impetuous valor of Carolina, stung with asserted dominion over her, and burning with shame at her irresolution and timidity, have endured so long, but from her relations to her sister States, and deference to them. Multitudes were ready, with reckless precipitancy, to unite in an assault, from the very night of the furtive occupation of the fort.

And what, I ask, but God's present, restraining and directing providence, held in check fool-hardy intrepidity during the three months in which she stood alone? Whence the wisdom and moderation of our rulers, military officers, and citizen soldiery, which repressed such dangerous impetuosity, and which led our people, as with one heart, to look to God, to recognize and confide in him; which inspired such courageous preparation and readiness for conflict; such fortitude and perseverance; such unanimity; such willing sacrifices; such wise counsels; such energetic measures; such scientific and inventive skill in devising and in constructing forts; such a conciliatory spirit and eminent statesmanship, and dispatch in the action of our Convention, in the appointment of its cabinet, in its papers addressed to the public, and in its proposed Constitution for a Southern Confederacy? Was not God's providence manifest in the mediation and wise delays of Senator Davis and others, and afterwards of Judge Campbell, in Washington; in the glorious results of the bloodless victory over the *Star of the West*, and its magic power in uniting and harmonizing seven Southern States; in the wonderful manner in which they were united in opinion, and cemented into one; in their early Congress; in the election of Mr. Davis; in their provisional Constitution, tariff, and military and financial arrangements; in the unanimity with which the people ratified and approved their acts; in the speedy assemblage of a regular Congress and adoption of a per-

manent Constitution; in the perfect organization of a Government; and in the universal favor with which their measures have been received, even at the North, until recently, and in Europe? Was there not a manifest providence in that blinded madness and fatuity in the Federal Government which led to the rejection of every overture from Virginia and Kentucky, and in the proclamation of war, which has added four more powerful States to the Southern Confederacy? Who that has eyes to see, or head to understand, can fail to realize that God was with us, as our Emanuel, and to cry out, What hath God wrought? But the wise and gracious providence of God toward the South in this movement, is further manifested in leading her to take her present stand against the tyrannous usurpations of the North, while yet strong in men, in means, in spirit, determination, hope and confidence of victory; in providing her beforehand with some portion of the arms and ammunition now so necessary; in giving her time to organize, arm, equip, and discipline; and, thus far, in granting such wonderful success to all her movements.

In December last this State and city were wholly unprepared to undertake a war. Our forts, our arms, our arsenal, were in possession of Federal troops. We had no fortifications, no organization, no military commanders of experience, and but little ammunition. Any attempt at fortifying ourselves at Moultrie, Pinckney, Johnson, and Morris Island, might easily have been prevented by Sumter and a fleet; and in the numberless delays and disappointments, and contradictory reports, and vacillating policy, of the Administration, which deferred hope and delayed action, until the last hidden battery was finished and the rifled cannon was placed in position, and a force adequate to all emergencies were at their posts and thoroughly drilled, and General Beauregard could say that every thing was in readiness—*which was only on the night of the attack*—do we

not behold the omnipotent and omniscient providence of God, making all things work together for the glorious result accomplished?

The resignation and devotion to the Southern cause of naval and military officers, to such a multiplied extent, and including the greatest, wisest and most energetic in the Federal service; the organization of new and efficient floating and land batteries; the ardor, self-denying labor, and unflinching endurance of our citizens, and, preëminently, of our State soldiery; the hopeful confidence and devotion of our people; and, above all, God's wonderful providence during the battle, in giving coolness, intrepidity and endurance to our men; in directing our fire, and diverting that of the enemy; in so immediately crippling and driving him away from his barbette guns and interior mortars, which must have been destructive to life; in delivering, in numerous instances, from apparently inevitable death; in diverting the energies of our enemies by frequent fire; in blowing up their cartridges, grenades, and other preparations for defence and destruction; in closing effectually their magazine; in enveloping them in smoke, and causing momentary danger of the general explosion of their magazine and mines; in imparting such daring and chivalrous spirit to Senator Wigfall and the aids of General Beauregard; in awakening such universal sympathy and desire to succor the heroic bravery of Anderson and his men; in securing to South Carolina, and preëminently to her Charleston soldiery, such unequalled glory and unmitigated rejoicing; such untarnished honor and such triumph over all feelings of retaliation or revenge; in crowning with such a halo of splendor a State so ridiculed and reviled for her contemptible littleness and pride; in a victory of unrivalled significance and almost miraculous mercy, achieved by her own counsels, her own money, and means, and men, with the addition of her illustrious general and other high officers and engineers—these are, each and all,

the stately steppings of God's wonder-working and majestic providence, working out, in His own mysterious way, our defence, deliverance and glory.

The fall of Sumter and of Sumter's flag was a signal gun from the battlements of heaven, announcing from God to every Southern State, "This cause is mine—come ye up, come to the help of the Lord against the mighty," and saying to the North, "Thou shalt not go up, nor fight against your brethren. Return every man unto his house, for this thing is of Me, saith the Lord." It was the tocsin of alarm and defeat to our foes, and the trumpet-call to battle and to victory to every laggard friend. It was the knell of the departed Union, and the annunciation of a new empire on the earth. It inaugurated, with loud acclaim, the unfurling of a young nation's flag; and in the destruction of two lives, and the serious injury of three others, in the abortive attempt to salute the flag of a desecrated and now subjugated Union, it was a startling rebuke of that idolatry which has spread that flag on the communion table, suspended it at the entrance and over the steeples of Churches; which has delivered it, even at Princeton, to theological students, who were exhorted to "stand by *our* flag"—not that banner which Christ has given because of the truth—who, having made the Chapel ring with its national song, filled the air with shouts and hurrahs! Oh, how did God punish such profanity at Sumter, and again at Alexandria, where Colonel Ellsworth suffered death for his indignity to the Confederate flag, and a seaman from the fleet, who attempted to replace it with the Federal flag, fell and was instantly killed!

The fall of Sumter has acted like the spear of Ithuriel. It has transformed the seeming into the real shape and proportions of the man. It has revealed the North to itself, to us, and to the world. It has revealed us to ourselves, and to one another, as confederated by bonds of honor and happiness, which make us, while "distinct as the billows,

yet one as the sea," and as the sea, world-wide in our commercial circumference, and producing commodities which are the source of priceless and ceaseless blessings to every continent, and omnipotent, under God, to resist any power exerted to arrest our progress and roll back our tide of empire.

The fall of Sumter has made bare and brought to light the hidden works of darkness and mystery of iniquity. It has proved that, with all the conservatism and professed love of peace at the North, the love of power is greater; that with all their devotion to the Union, it means a union of Southern interest for the enrichment of the North, and of Southern conservatism in politics and religion for the repression of anarchy and fanaticism; and that the real eagle so fondly worshipped is the golden one. Love for the South evaporates, and leaves only love for self. Piety succumbs to pride, and patriotism to passion, and charity itself, while covering any multitude of sins, and forgiving all manner of evil, and tolerant of all the errors and isms which spawn and multiply among them, sees in disobedience to the tyrant nothing but damnable heresy; in secession from the hateful conspiracy against our rights and liberties, an unpardonable sin; and in toleration for the exercise of self-government, and in consent that we should be governed by chosen rulers, an enormity only equalled by that which cast Satan out of heaven, and Adam out of Paradise. Union with us was purgatory, but union without us is perdition. The South has been confessedly abused, pillaged, and reduced to a tributary province, but Northern conservatism requires, on peril of destruction, that we shall rely upon its "unmeaning promises of good intentions, which amount to nothing more than irresponsible promises to be merciful to the vanquished."

"The howl of vindictive passion," clamoring for a war of vengeance and subjugation, has at length reached our

Church. That sacred sanctuary, our holy and happy Zion—where the scattered tribes have been accustomed to repair, and feel how good and how pleasant it was for brethren to dwell together in unity—has been polluted, and "made a den of thieves." The Old School Presbyterian Church—the last link that held fast to union, amidst the crashing timbers of the hastening wreck—is now broken; willingly, wilfully and wickedly broken—broken against the protestations of the wise, and in the unavoidable absence of almost all true-hearted representatives of their Southern brethren, and against the formal advice even of the wily Cabinet at Washington. The Church of our revolutionary fathers is now yoked to the chariot-wheel of Cæsar, and, in the madness of a base and venal servitude, is pledged to prayerful loyalty and devotion to an imperial despot, whose little finger is heavier than any yoke ever imposed by Britain, and under whose heel their own liberties, as well as ours, and the Bible, the palladium of them all, and the Constitution, and all laws, human and divine, are crushed into submission to the higher law of his own "irrepressible conflict," and to the will of a wild, lawless, and godless majority.

Amid these wild waves of tempestuous commotion, with war raging around us, and woes innumerable enveloping our future, God has given us, in the bloodless victory of Sumter, an anchor of hope, both sure and steadfast—a pledge and promise of defence and deliverance. And, though not yet referred to by any writer, I find, in recent researches, that in 1755, in the commencement of our revolutionary struggle, Dr. Langdon, on May 31st, calls upon the people to praise God "that in the late action at Chelsea, fought on May 27th, when several hundreds of our soldiery, the greater part open to the fire of so many cannon, swivels, and muskets; from a battery advantageously situated; from two armed cutters and many barges full of marines; and from ships-of-the-line in the harbor—*not one man on*

our side was killed, and but two or three wounded, although one hundred and five of the enemy were killed, and one hundred and sixty wounded.

Mr. Mansfield, also, in a discourse, preached at Roxbury, in November, 1775, remarks: "Providence has smiled upon the camp, in permitting so few fatal accidents, and has evidently been its safeguard." "I am informed," he adds, "that *by means of two thousand balls thrown from the opposite lines, five men only have been taken off. I perceive, also, that by reason of three hundred balls, etc., thrown into Roxbury in the course of one month, but two were wounded, and no man was immediately killed. It is to be remarked, also, that not one person was hurt in the course of above three hundred shells thrown into a fortification upon ploughed hill, in Charlestown.*"

Thus did God encourage our revolutionary fathers in their long and desperate contest with the mightiest power on earth, by such signal proofs of His extraordinary presence, and providence and blessing, to put the most undoubting trust in Him, and to look for that divine succor which could make them conquerors, and more than conquerors, over all their enemies. *And this lesson our fathers learnt by heart, and carried with them* through all the perilous disasters and distresses of their seven years' war. "The Lord," they said, "will be our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. He can command the stars in their courses to fight His battles, and all the elements to wage war with His enemies. He can destroy them with innumerable plagues, or send faintness into their hearts, so that the men of might shall not find their hands. In a variety of methods He can work salvation for us, as He did for His people in ancient days, and according to the many remarkable deliverances granted in former times to Great Britain and New England."

Our enemies themselves, therefore, being judges, God has thus far, in the bloodless, and eventful, and incalculably important battle of Sumter, and in a series of victories

since of our troops and batteries, who (with immensely weaker forces, and when taken by surprise) have intimidated and disheartened our enemies; greatly inspirited and fired the courageous daring of our soldiery; inspired confidence and good hope to our people generally; and powerfully commended us and our cause to other nations around us, and to the European powers, who are most deeply interested in this revolution.

And now, O Lord God of our fathers! who didst lead them through dangers and death, discomfort and defeat, and all the perils and sacrifices of the revolution, to final victory, independence and glory, undertake for us, their children, inheritors of their blood and blood-bought heritage of liberty. We lift up our eyes unto Thee. We have looked to Thy Word and providence to know Thy will and our duty. And Thou hast appeared, O Lord God of hosts, on our behalf, and done great things for us, whereof we are glad. And now, O Lord God, behold this great multitude who have come up against us, to destroy us without cause. Thou who sittest in the heavens, look down upon these rulers who take counsel together, and upon this people, who imagine a vain thing, and do Thou hold them in derision, and break them in pieces as a potter's vessel.

Our cause is open unto Thee, with WHOM—and not with THEM—we have to do, and we appeal to Thy righteous justice. We ask no subjugation of our enemies, nor any portion of their rightful inheritance, privilege or property, nor any unnecessary destruction of their persons. But we ask, O righteous God, a just, honorable and lasting peace—that we may enjoy life, liberty and happiness, under the pure and uncorrupted Constitution of our fathers. We ask THEE to avenge us—to avenge us of our adversaries—to vindicate our righteous claims—to justify our course—and to commend our character and counsels to an *impartial present*, and to all future generations.

The Constitution, and the Union under it, as ordained by Thee, through the ordinance of our fathers—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

Our solemn compact, entered into with our present enemies, in Thy sight, and recorded in the chancery of heaven—with all that it gives and withholds, with what it positively and negatively lays down as to the respective provinces of national and State Government, with what is reserved and what is recorded, and with the coequal character, rights, and territorial privileges, under the internal institutions and laws of each united sovereignty—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The first treacherous violation of that compact, in 1787 and 1789, by our Northern confederates, in wresting from us equal rights in the territories of our own generous donation—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The fugitive slave law, THEN first established as a compromise, on which alone the South yielded to continued union—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT, and to the open, persistent and perfidious violation of it for forty years past, and to the existing laws of many of the very States who are fighting for a union they have themselves nullified, as "a compact with hell, and iniquitous before God."

The act of Congress establishing slavery and a rigid slave code over all the Louisiana territory, in accordance with the terms of the treaty with France—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The refusal by Congress, on three occasions, to admit Missouri as a State, under that act and treaty—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The Missouri Compromise—reluctantly, and to her own grievous dishonor and injury, *submitted to by the South*—and by which she was again robbed of her territory, to the extent of several large States—is there, to testify to Southern honesty, honor, and generosity, and to the perfidious

rapacity of a self-aggrandizing North—AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The many acts of insolent and audacious violation of the Missouri Compromise, and the continued rapacious grasping of power and property by the North—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The fishery bounty, the navigation acts, the tariff monopolies, the home appropriations, the postal laws, by all which the South has been made to pay yearly hundreds of millions into Northern hands—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The crusade and irrepressible conflict against slavery, based upon a higher law than the Constitution and the Bible itself, and in open conflict, O God! with Thy Word and providence—IS THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO IT.

The unintermitted and increasing abuse, defamation, false witness, lying calumny, incendiary publications, treasonable insurrections, raids and underground railroad robberies, the arson, theft and murder excited by abolition emissaries, and the murder of Southern citizens in the streets of Northern cities, without redress, and with the connivance or requisition of State authorities—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The long-suffering patience, and warnings, protestations, appeals, nullification, and conventions of the South—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The nomination, election, and inauguration of Lincoln, on the very basis of this perfidious, aggressive, unconstitutional, and infamously dishonorable policy—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The course of Carolina, and the offered compromises of every other State, *until dignity was sunk in abject entreaty*, almost as degrading as that of Kentucky itself, ARE THERE, and *their contemptuous rejection*—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

The usurpation of Lincoln, Scott & Co.—the arbitrary, unconstitutional, tyrannous, unnatural, inhuman, and diabolical course pursued by them—the barbarities perpetrated, the blood of patriot martyrs murdered, the curses of outraged women, the wailing of widows, the tears of orphans, houses burned, cities subjugated, fields devastated, *all decency and civilization set at defiance by unlicensed lynx-eyed generals and soldiers*—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

May the Lord hear us in this day of trouble, and the name of the God of Jacob defend us, send us help from His sanctuary, and strengthen us out of Zion. We will rejoice in His salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up our banners.

Thus saith the Lord God of our fathers, I will deliver thee and this city out of the hands of your enemy, AND THIS THAT HE HAS DONE SHALL BE A SIGN UNTO THEE, FROM THE LORD, THAT THE LORD WILL DO THIS THING THAT HE HAS SPOKEN.

ARTICLE II.

THE WALDENSES AND INFANT BAPTISM.

It is proposed in this article to show that the rite of infant baptism has always been practiced by the Waldensian Church. The antiquity of the body of Christians known by this name is conceded by ecclesiastical historians of every party. All Protestant writers agree in ascribing to them great purity of doctrine and of life, in a time of abounding corruption in both. Deriving the articles of their faith and their rules of conduct immediately from the Scriptures, and maintaining their right to do so against the authority of the papal hierarchy, to which the entire Christian world besides bowed in unquestioning servility,

their views and customs are regarded as having no ordinary weight in determining, on all controverted points, what the doctrines and usages of the primitive Church were. Hence, Prelatists have made anxious search among them for some trace of a diocesan episcopacy. Hence, too, our Baptist brethren have labored, with the zeal they are accustomed to bestow upon all subjects relating to the rite from which they take their name, to create the impression that they rejected the ordinance of infant baptism. The expression "Waldensian Baptists," has of late years become one of frequent recurrence in addresses and writings designed to promote the views of the anti-pedobaptists. An examination of the question at issue is justified by its importance, whether that importance be real, or merely factitious.

Preliminary to the direct testimony in support of our position, are two or three facts, of much presumptive value. One is, the fact that the Waldenses of the present day observe the rite. Some four or five years since, this was denied, or at least questioned, in certain quarters. But later investigations, directed to the point, have removed every pretext for doubt on the subject. The following is an extract from a letter of Dr. Revel to Dr. Robert Baird, which first appeared in the *New York Observer*, and was subsequently copied into various journals throughout the country. We insert the passage below, not only as setting forth the present practice of the Waldenses, but also for the light it throws upon other aspects of the matter in controversy, as we shall hereafter see. In order, however, that our readers may properly estimate the position of Dr. Revel, who here appears both as a witness and as an authority, they should bear in mind that he fills the highest office known in the polity of the Church to which he belongs—the Moderatorship of their Synod—an office held during life; and, further, that he is the President of their highest literary and theological institution. If any man

living may claim the right of speaking authoritatively on such a subject, it is he.

PASTOR REVEL TO REV. DR. BAIRD.

As to the questions which you have addressed to me touching the *mode of administering Baptism,* I hasten to answer them in the briefest and most precise manner possible. 1. The mode of baptizing in our Churches is *pedobaptism,* by the sprinkling of pure water on the forehead by the Minister, who pronounces solemnly the sacramental words, Matt. 28 : 19, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 2. This practice has never varied in our Church, and we have never had, nor do we now have, any opposing or Baptist party. 3. Although the Waldenses of Piedmont have always been *pedobaptists,* we find enemies who accuse them not only of rejecting the baptism of children, but baptism in general! This accusation has apparently some foundation, inasmuch as in the middle ages it was brought against those who in the South of France were called *Waldenses,* but who were a portion of the *Cathari.* It is thus that the work of Rainerius, "*contra Waldenses,*" sets forth and charges upon us the doctrines and practices of the Cathari. But you know that the Cathari, who for a long time existed in the South of France, derived their doctrines from the East, which they wrought up into a mixture of Gnostic, Manichean, and Paulician principles, with some of the truths of the Gospel, and that, according as there were more or less of the evangelical element, they professed a *dualism* absolute or relative. But all the Cathari were agreed in rejecting all that was traditional and external. They pretended to reëstablish the primitive and apostolic simplicity, and this under a form corresponding to their own principles. They rejected pedobaptism, and, for the most part, baptism in general. The first class maintained even that John the Baptist was an agent of Satan, and that his baptism was a means of enrolling disciples. They pretended that in the New Testament *baptism* stands for *repentance.* The true baptism for them was made by the imposition of hands and the prayer which they called *consolamentum,* and the latter was of a double nature. They had one for the *credentes* (those who were just introduced into the sect), and another for those who were called *perfecti,* or *consolati.*

It being conceded, then, that the Waldenses practice infant baptism in the present day, it devolves upon those who deny that they have practiced it from the beginning, to show when and by what means the change in their views was effected. A revolution as important as this in the views of a whole Church in relation to one of the two sacraments which they hold to be of divine authority,

would surely have left some trace upon the page of history. We have not been able, after reading various accounts of them, from various sources, to find the slightest intimation of such an event. Jones, a Baptist historian of England, who has written largely concerning them, from their rise in the world to the end of the seventeenth century, whilst, as we shall show in the sequel, he endeavors to destroy, by suppressions and misquotations, their testimony in favor of the ordinance, does not pretend that any change had taken place in their practice up to the time when his history left them. It is simply impossible for the change to have taken place since that time, and yet no one have transmitted a record of it—no one, not even the Waldensians themselves, have known when and how it came about.

Another admitted fact, pertinent to our object, is, that at the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, under the labors of Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Calvin, and others, the Waldenses affiliated with these men, and with the Churches planted by their ministry. Salutations were interchanged between the parties by deputies and written correspondence. Subjects on which a difference of opinion existed, or were supposed to exist, were freely discussed. Yet, in all their conferences, that of infant baptism was not once alluded to as a matter to be adjusted. Here there was a perfect agreement, so far as appears from the extended records which have descended to our times, between all concerned, Waldensians, Lutherans, and Calvinians. Between Calvin and the Waldenses the most fraternal relations existed, from the time of his residence in Strasburg to the close of his life, as may be seen in his letters, recently published. The effect of this intercourse, developing so beautiful a harmony of views, was the rapid and unresisted absorption of the Waldensians into the Reformed Church, except that portion residing in the Valleys of Piedmont. Here, being more concentrated and strong, they have maintained to this day their distinctiveness as a

religious body, in intimate fellowship, however, with the evangelical Churches of the Calvinistic type contiguous to them. All this may be seen in detail in Adam Blair's elaborate history of the Waldensian Church; also in the "Israel of the Alps," the elegant work of Dr. Muston, Pastor of the Waldensian Church at Bordeaux, and son of the Muston who was for many years Moderator of the General Synod.

Soon after the Reformation began, the Anabaptists of Germany arose. Why did not the Waldenses seek fellowship with them, instead of the party of Luther and Calvin? This would have been their natural recourse if they had been Anabaptists. Murdock, the learned translator of Mosheim's Church History, says: "It is a well known historic fact, that in the sixteenth century the genuine descendants of the old Waldensians, Wickliffites and Hussites, who were numerous in France, Belgium, England, Bohemia, Moravia, etc., readily united with the Lutheran and Reformed communities, and at length became absorbed in them, and that very few, if any, of them ever manifested a preference for the Mennonites, or for any of the anti-pedobaptist sects of the age; which is adverse to the supposition of a literal or legitimate descent of the Mennonites from the pure Waldensians." *

Another consideration, of no small weight in connection with this, is, that there was much in the opinions and practices of the times when the Waldenses came into view as a distinct body of Christians, and for many centuries afterward, to force them into a position of antagonism to the ordinance of infant baptism. The rite was shamefully abused by the Papists. Its nature, design and offices were all perverted. A multitude of silly, superstitious ceremonies had accumulated around its administration, against which the clear spiritual perceptions of these Bible-taught

* Mos., III., 229, Note.

Christians could but revolt. So that it would have been a matter of no great surprise if they had allowed their feelings of disgust to carry them to the extreme of rejecting the ordinance itself. But they wisely discriminated between the abuse and the legitimate use—between the rite as instituted by God, and as deformed by excrescences originating in human folly. Against the latter they protested in the most pointed terms, as will be shown in some extracts from their accredited writings, to be adduced hereafter; to the former—the ordinance itself—not a word of opposition has yet been produced from the formularies of their faith, or from any author acknowledged by them as an exponent of their views. Its rejection or omission by them, under so strong temptations to such a course, would make little or nothing against the institution, as historically attested; their adherence to it, is testimony of much value.

The three considerations now proposed would go far, in the absence of more direct proof, to demonstrate that the Waldenses were Pedobaptists. They are confirmed, however, by testimony that leaves no room for argument or doubts. Before proceeding to adduce that testimony, it is proper to exhibit the sources from which it is derived.

After the excitement attending the inauguration of the reform commenced by Luther had in some degree subsided, and the Protestant community had assumed a definite shape, the history of the remarkable people who, in much poverty and in despite of severe persecutions, had maintained a pure faith and worship, from a period extending many centuries back towards the days of the Apostles, began to engage the inquiries of leading minds in the Reformed Churches. Efforts were instituted for gathering all the existing monuments and relics of their origin and early years. It was known that they had manuscripts among them containing statements of their doctrines, and directions as to the order of their worship. Diligent search

was made for as many of these as might have survived the lapse of time and the calamities to which the people had been subjected by their enemies. In 1602 the Provincial Synod of Dauphiny, in France, lying adjacent to the region in which the Waldenses had their principal Churches, appointed "certain persons to collect all sorts of documents bearing on the history of the life, doctrines and persecutions of the Albigeois and Vaudois," or Waldenses. These papers were afterwards transferred to Jean Paul Perrin, a member of that Synod, and pastor of the Church at Nyons, (not Lyons, as is frequently represented,) which was situated near the borders of the Waldensian territory proper. Five years later, the National Synod of France, at Rochel, in which Perrin sat as a deputy from Dauphiny, passed an order in these words: "Monsieur Perrin is intreated to finish his begun history of the 'True Estate of the Albigenses and Waldenses;' and to help him in it, all persons having memoirs by them, either of the doctrines, discipline or persecutions of those poor saints of Christ, are charged to transmit them to him with all possible care and diligence." In 1609 the National Synod, held at St. Maixant, received a report from Perrin of his progress, with a rude draught of the work, which was approved by the body, and five of their ministers were requested by name to transmit to him "whatever memoirs they have found out, or can get, so that it (the book) may be published suddenly." The Synod at the same time engaged "to assist him with their bounty, to help to bear his great expenses in books, and for its impression." The work was presented to the National Synod, at Rivas, in 1612, and was put into the hands of five ministers, "who were ordered to bring in their opinion of it." In consideration of his charges, the "Synod ordered him (Perrin) the sum of three hundred livres." At a subsequent stage in the sessions of the same Synod, the committee to examine the work having reported, Perrin was desired to review it, and present it to the Synod

of Dauphiny, that it might be published. Again: two years later, the National Synod charges the Synod of Dauphiny to read over Perrin's book, "who is also required, as soon as it is printed, to send a copy to every one of the provinces." The Synod of Dauphiny, in 1617, reported to the National Synod, sitting at Vitré, that it had seen and perused the work, but that, for some reason, not stated, it had not been published or distributed. The National Synod then ordained, "That the said history shall be sent to our honored brethren, the pastors and professors in the Church and University of *Geneva*, who shall be desired by the Synod of Dauphiny to peruse it." The publication was made the next year, and in 1620 the National Synod, at Alez, "applauded and thanked" the author for his work, and being informed of the "numerousness of his family, and that he had a great charge of children," exhorted the Synod of Dauphiny "to take care of him and his family, according to the laws of Christian charity and the great merits of the said Monsieur Perrin."

We have presented these facts, gleaned from the acts, decisions and decrees of the National Synod of the Reformed Churches in France, as published in "Quick's Synodocon," inasmuch as a labored effort has been made to disparage the authority of Perrin, by some who feel that his history, if accredited, is fatal to their cause. Perhaps no book was ever written with more diligent and persevering efforts to render it trustworthy. But Perrin does not stand unsupported.

In 1669 Leger, "Pastor and Moderator of the Churches of the Valley," published his "History General of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, or Vaudois," in which he inserted various documents which were recognized as the authoritative exponents of the Waldensian faith, as far back as any such records could be found. In many passages Leger gives the original text of the papers in the Romance or Provençal language, in columns parallel

with his translation into his vernacular French. Perrin and Leger publish, for the most part, the same documents, and in the same words. A comparison of the two works, so far as the subject now in hand is concerned, has led to the detection of only one discrepancy, and that as to a word, merely, that does not materially affect the sense of the passage.

Leger and Perrin are sustained by Sir Samuel Morland, who was Oliver Cromwell's ambassador at the Court of Turin, and who, whilst in their country, made an extensive collection of their documents then extant, which he has inserted in his large history of the people. His position, as representative of the English Government, then sympathizing deeply with the persecuted Churches of Piedmont, afforded him rare facilities for gathering materials for his great work. The original manuscript copies of the documents which he obtained he deposited in the Library of Cambridge University, where they still exist. Morland gives the same documents that Perrin and Leger had given, with only such slight variations in their contents as naturally occur when copies are multiplied by transcription.

In the appendix to his history, Blair, already referred to, has published an English translation of the most important of the papers furnished by the three authors above named. In the extracts which we shall presently make, we shall use his work, having verified them by a comparison, severally, with the passages as found in the three older authors. With this explanation of what is meant by the writings of the Waldenses, and of the means by which they have been transmitted to us, we proceed to the testimony they afford on the subject of infant baptism.

I. Our first extract is made from the "*Spiritual Almanack.*" This appears to be a summary of the faith of the Waldenses, compiled from other documents of authority among them. It is published by Perrin and Leger. The date is very ancient. Blair states that the writings com-

prised in it "are mentioned as existing in 1120; but the slight diversity of dialect suggests the probability that some of them, as the Discipline, might be earlier, or that they were composed at different times. At all events, the Waldenses and Albigenses have unanimously agreed that these declarations express their sentiments in regard to the doctrine, government, morality, and discipline of the Church; and demonstrate that Christianity was still preserved in the Valleys and in the South of France." * Dr. Muston, in his "Bibliography of the Waldenses," appended to his work, whose title has already been given, mentions the "Spiritual Almanack," and says that its treatise on the sacraments, from which we are about to quote, is to be met with in a number of Vaudois works.†

The Almanack treats of baptism, as of other points of doctrine, and, after giving an exposition of its general design, holds this language: "And for this cause we present our children in baptism, ‡ which they ought to do to whom the children are nearest, as their parents; and they to whom God has given this charity." Nothing could be more explicit than this.

II. "*The Ancient Discipline of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of the Piedmont*," (published by Perrin, Leger, and Morland.) Perrin says this was the discipline under which the Waldenses and Albigenses lived. Morland states that it was extracted out of divers authentic manuscripts, written in their own language, several centuries before either Calvin or Luther lived. It received the express approbation of Luther, Melancthon and Bucer. Its great antiquity, to say nothing of its contents, renders it a document of rare interest. Our concern, however, is with its testimony bearing on the question of infant baptism. The ninth

---

* Blair, I., 223, 224.

† *Ibid.*, II., 476.

‡ Et c'est pour cela qu'on presente les Enfans au Baptême.—Léger.

article relates to dancing, or balls, and condemns that species of amusement with a severity of language that we do not remember ever to have seen surpassed. Among the reasons assigned for its sinfulness, this is given: "They who thus dance break the agreement which they made with God at their baptism, when their God-fathers promised for them to renounce the devil and all his pomp." The promises here supposed to be broken by their dancing were made *for* them, not *by* them—a plain implication that they were baptized at an age when they were regarded as incapable of making promises for themselves.

III. In 1442, at Kuttenburg, was held a Synod of the Taborites, a branch of the Waldensian community, in which a full Confession of their Faith was made. The tenth article is in these words: "Baptism is the external sign of the internal washing from sin. Children can also be initiated, on condition, however, that having come to an advanced age, they make a public profession of their faith."*

IV. In the latter part of the fifteenth century, the Bohemian Brethren, another and highly honored branch of the Waldensian family, having a respite from persecution, prepared a full system of rules for their government and discipline. Among the duties assigned to the deacons, was that of aiding the pastor, by instructing the children and catechumens; and it is added: "Being viewed as candidates for the ministry, they occasionally preached the Gospel in the villages, under the minister's inspection, and baptized children in his absence." Further on, in the same document, we have this statement: "At Baptism a text was the ground of a short discourse, to show that God's covenant extended to the issue of believers; prayer offered to God to cleanse the infant from corruption by the blood of Christ, to regenerate it by the Spirit, to give it the seal of grace

* See the Confession, *in extenso*, quoted by Blair (Vol. II., 77) from Lenfants.

by baptism, and to place it among his chosen; the minister then named the child, and baptized it with pure water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." *

V. The United Brethren of Bohemia, mentioned in the last paragraph, in 1508 presented to King Ladislaus and his Nobles an "Apology," in which they defended themselves against various charges brought against them by their enemies; also a "Confession of Faith," which was subsequently enlarged, and in 1535 was addressed by the Nobles and Barons of Bohemia to Ferdinand, King of the Romans and Bohemia. Both of these instruments are preserved by Perrin. Leger and Morland give an abridgement of the Confession. Here are extracts from both:

(*a.*) From the "*Apology.*" The fourth reproach, which they say was cast upon them by their "adversaries, like angry, barking dogs," was, that they denied the baptism of infants; to which they replied in the words of the Spiritual Almanack: "The time and place of those who ought to be baptized is not ordained, but the charity of the Church and congregation ought to serve as the rule in it, etc. And, therefore, they to whom the children are nearest allied are under obligation to present the infants to be baptized; as are the parents, and those to whom God has given such a charity." This passage is important, as showing that the Spiritual Almanack was still held in repute as the authorized exponent of their doctrines, and also as showing their views up to the time immediately preceding the Reformation. On this article in the "Apology," Perrin makes a remark which serves to explain whatever seeming practical neglect of the rite, if any, existed among them, namely, that when the Waldensian pastors were absent from their own charges, in the service of the Church at large, the children were

* Blair, II., 100, 107, quoting from Holmes, pp. 64–91, and "Account of the Bohemians," pp. 75–138.

long kept without baptism. In such cases, some parents allowed their children to receive the ordinance at the hands of the Romish Priests; others would not consent to this, in consequence of the superstitious ceremonies the Priests appended to its administration. Muston, Blair, and other writers on the affairs of this people, tell us that, the pastors being few, and the Churches widely dispersed, the former were accustomed to itinerate from Church to Church, occupying frequently one or two years in making their circuits. This accounts for their absences, as mentioned by Perrin.

(*b.*) From the "*Confession.*" Article on Baptism. "Likewise they teach that children are to be baptized unto salvation, and to be consecrated to Christ according to His Word: 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' etc.* Our friends, therefore, depending upon these words, baptize children in the name of the Holy Trinity. Because the place is universal, 'Teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc. Nor do they henceforth rebaptize them, nor have they ever rebaptized."

We give another extract from this Confession, and ask that special attention may be directed to the clause put in Italics. It shows, not only that baptism was administered to those who were incapable of exercising personal faith, but, also, what class of persons were intended when personal faith was mentioned as a prerequisite to baptism. The subject of the Article from which we quote is the sacraments, Baptism and the Supper. After insisting upon a due attention to these institutions of the Gospel, the Confession proceeds thus: "The sacraments of themselves, or, as some say, *ex opere operato*, from the work wrought, do not confer grace upon those who are not first endowed with

---

* Nous enseignons semblablement qu'il faut baptizer les Enfans a salut, et les consacrer Jesus Christ selon son commandement, etc.—Leger, Book I., 101.

good inclinations, and inwardly quickened by the Holy Spirit, nor bestow that justifying faith which renders the mind of man obedient, trusting and compliant to God in all things; for faith is necessary to precede—*we speak of adults*—which may vivify man by the Holy Ghost, and may inject good notions into the heart; for without faith, neither salvation nor righteousness exists, nor do sacraments do good to any one."

If children were not subjects of baptism, the reference to adults, in the above, is unmeaning. Besides, unless children are an exception to the rule requiring personal faith in order to baptism, then the Brethren assert that they are incapable of salvation. It is the inevitable dilemma, "no baptism, no salvation."

VI. In 1532, at a time when George Morel, who fills a large space in the Waldensian history, was a pastor in Piedmont, and wrote the memoirs of their Churches, states that above eight hundred thousand persons professed the religion of the Waldenses, the pastors and heads of families in the Valleys of Piedmont assembled at Angrogna, subscribed certain articles of faith, which, as they affirm, they "have sworn that they believe, and wish to hold themselves as acknowledging them conformed to the Holy Scriptures, and containing the summary of doctrine, which has been taught from father to son, according to the Word of God, as the faithful have done in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah." The seventeenth Article reads thus: "That touching the matter of the sacraments, the Holy Scriptures determine that Jesus Christ has left us only two sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, which we receive to show that we wish to continue in the Holy Communion in which we are entered by Holy Baptism, *being little infants*, and for the commemoration of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, who has washed us from our sins by his precious blood."

This Confession is recorded by Perrin, Leger, and Morland. Blair states that the manuscript is preserved in the Library at Cambridge.

VII. In 1541–2, the Waldenses of Merindol presented to the Parliament of Aix, the King, and others, a "Confession of Faith," containing twenty-six sections. The seventeenth is on Baptism, and concludes with these emphatic words: "They, also, err egregiously, who remove children from Baptism." The heresy of Anabaptism had, not long before, arisen in Germany, and was spreading with the rapidity that usually attends the progress of fanaticism in times of high and general excitement in the popular mind. Hence the form of the deliverance on the subject of infant baptism.

This Confession is also recorded by Perrin, Leger, and Morland. Faber gives it in Latin, the expression above quoted being quite as decisive as it is in our English translation.

We have thus produced a series of extracts extending over four centuries, beginning with the earliest authentic records which history furnishes of the people, and ending about the time when the Waldenses, with an exception already noted, were merged into the Reformed Churches. It would be easy to produce evidence of their continuing to a much later date—indeed, to the present day—in the practice of the rite. But it is unnecessary, since the controversy concerns, not the modern, but the ancient, people of that name. Nor have we adduced all the testimony which their acknowledged documents supply. There are others, which, to our own mind, are not less decisive than those which have been cited; as, for example, a passage in their celebrated treatise styled "Antichrist," in which they inveigh so severely against the superstitious appendages with which the Romish Church had corrupted the ordinance—such as the sign of the cross on the infant's breast and forehead, the salt in its mouth, the spittle in its

ear, the plunging it three times in the water, with much else of the same character—against all which things they vehemently protest, yet not a word do they utter in denial or disparagement of the rite itself. If, however, what has been brought forward shall not be deemed satisfactory to any one of our readers, it is not probable that any number of passages from the same sources would suffice for his conviction.

We turn to evidence of another character—the expressed opinions of historians who have investigated the subjects. Passages might be cited from the pages of Perrin, Leger, and Morland, showing that they had no doubt as to the observance of the ordinance among the Waldenses from the rise of that community. And no one ever possessed greater facilities for obtaining correct information than they. It is needless, however, to occupy our space with quotations from their pages, giving their individual opinions, since it will occur to every reader that they could not have entertained a doubt on the subject without discrediting the very documents which they have published to the world as the genuine writings of the Waldensians, and the authoritative standards of their faith.

Dr. Gilly, a clergyman of the Established Church of England, who has published "Researches among the Vaudois," the result of two or more "Excursions" into the Valleys of the Piedmont, to whom that people, says Dr. Muston, are indebted for the establishment of the College over which Dr. Revel now presides, and who, as the same writer remarks, is "one of the most voluminous, learned and interesting of all modern authors who have written on the subject of the Vaudois"—Dr. Gilly says: "Nothing can be more false than the calumny that the Vaudois object to infant baptism," and adduces passages from their ancient writings in support of his assertion.*

---

* See Preface to Jones' Church History, fifth English edition, where Jones makes a feint of answering Gilly.

Dr. Wall, whose candor is only equalled by his learning and vast research, devotes a considerable space in his "History of Infant Baptism" to the question now before us. The result of his investigations is, that whilst there were probably some small and short-lived sects, sometimes confounded with the Waldenses, in the fifteenth century, that rejected infant baptism, "for the main body of the Waldenses, there is no probability at all" that they rejected it.* The reader, by turning back to Dr. Revel's letter to Dr. Baird, may learn something of the sects here referred to.

Allix, an English clergyman, published in 1690 his "Remarks on the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont," a work on which we have seen high encomiums bestowed by writers in the interest of our Baptist brethren. From the favor with which Jones and others of his party seem to regard Allix, we supposed, until we examined his book, that it contained evidence of some kind which they could make available to their cause. But not a sentence tending in that direction did a careful scrutiny of his pages bring to view; on the contrary, much of another tenor. One passage must suffice in this place. Allix is assigning reasons why the Patarines, a sect of the eleventh century, "were, for the most part, of the same opinions that were afterward asserted by the Waldenses," and he mentions as the sixth: "Because we find the Berengarians" (who, he states, were of the same stamp with the Patarines) "exposed to the same calumnies which were afterwards imputed to the Patarines and Waldenses. This is evident from the discourse of Guimondus, Bishop of Avasa,† where he accuseth them of overthrowing, as much as in them lay, lawful marriages and the baptism of infants."‡ From this it is manifest that Allix regarded the charge that the Waldenses denied infant baptism as a

* Vol. II., pp. 273, 266, 267.

† Lib. I., *contra*, Bereng.

‡ Allix, pp. 134, 135.

calumny. The passage shows another thing—that the denial of the ordinance of infant baptism, and the denial of the lawfulness of the marriage union, were coupled together—a significant fact, which one often encounters in traversing the dreary wastes through which the history of that age leads him, but a fact which one who knows what the Manichean heresy was, and knows to what extent it was then prevailing, even in the West, will have no difficulty in accounting for.

The list of authorities might be extended almost indefinitely, including such names as Archbishop Usher, Richard Baxter, Milner, Faber, Murdock, (translator of Mosheim,) Blair, Muston, Rev. T. Sims, of England, (who has examined the question particularly, and decides that the "Waldenses have, *to a certainty, always* approved and practiced the baptism of infants,") and, to mention no others, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, Gieseler, Professor in Göttingen, whose immense learning and rigid impartiality have placed him in the highest rank of authorities. The passage to be given is contained in a letter addressed by Gieseler to Dr. Muston, and may be seen in "The Israel of the Alps," Vol. I., page 3. Gieseler denies that Peter de Bruys, (the father of the Petrobrusian sect,) was one of the Vaudois. "For," he adds, "in the first place, he taught many things contrary to the doctrine of the Vaudois. He denied that infants ought to be baptized and that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was celebrated after its celebration by Christ himself."

In view of this overwhelming array of testimony and authorities, our readers will be surprised that a fact thus established by every species of evidence of which a historical event is capable, should ever have been called in question. They will be curious to know on what pretence it has been denied. We propose to gratify them in this very natural desire.

As far as we are authorized to speak on the subjects, by an investigation in which no little time has been employed, and a large number of books has been consulted, there are only two writers in the department of ecclesiastical history, whose researches have led them to examine the original sources of information, and whose success in their labors has caused their works to survive the authors, that venture to deny the prevalence of the rite amongst the Waldenses, before or since the Reformation, viz: Robert Robinson and William Jones, both of England. They were both Baptists, but this circumstance ought not to prejudice their credibility, if they had not made an unfair use of the authorities on which they rely for their statements.

Robinson, a man of brilliant parts and varied accomplishments, after attaining a high position among the Baptist ministers of England, adopted Socianian views, without, however, renouncing the dogmas of his former brethren in relation to the proper mode and subjects of baptism. Subsequently to the change of his faith, he wrote his "Ecclesiastical Researches," in which his effort throughout is to show that all the ancient Christians, who are worthy of the name, were Socinians, immersionists, and anti-pedobaptists. The intense sectarianism of his book, the bitter spirit pervading it, and its frequent palpable perversions of the established truths of history, have prevented it from acquiring any extensive credit or circulation, and it is seldom referred to by other writers, unless it be to find in Robinson support for opinions which all respectable historians contradict. The reader who may be able to command patience sufficient to carry him through one-third of the book, will be prepared to assent to every word of the following estimate of Robinson, from the pen of Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover Seminary, (a man from whom our Baptist brethren are very fond of quoting on certain points,) in a letter to his colleague, Dr. Leonard Woods, and published by the

latter in his "Infant Baptism." * Professor Stuart here speaks of another work of Robinson, that on Baptism, but his strictures are equally applicable to the work before us. "Having so often heard the book spoken highly of, and knowing something of Mr. Robinson's talents and character, I had a great curiosity to see it. I have examined it on various topics, and confess myself to be greatly disappointed, and not a little disgusted. There is every where in it an air of almost *profane levity*, which at times breaks forth into the most gross and *palpable indecency*. * * * Withal, there is such a gross and palpable unfairness in Robinson's examination of the testimony of the Christian Fathers, and such a shallow criticism, both on them and on the New Testament, that one may well wonder that this book should meet with encouragement among men of sobriety and good sense. There is, indeed, an appearance of a kind of learning in the author; but it is merely that of a literary *gourmand*, who has read every thing curious and entertaining, and but very little that is solid, and has reasoned and reflected still less on what he has read." Dr. Miller, of Princeton, has somewhere published an opinion of Robinson, concurring with that of Professor Stuart and Dr. Woods.

Robinson labors with great diligence to evade the testimony in favor of infant baptism among the Waldensians and other dissidents from the Romish Church. After one and another captious objection, which he seems conscious his readers will not regard as of any weight, he boldly asserts that neither the term "Infant," nor the term "Baptize," as used in the middle ages, is sufficiently definite and precise to enable us to determine positively that the one means a child of a few months or a few years old, or the other means the rite known in the Christian Church by that name. His words are: "The words 'Infant,' and

* Second edition, p. 140.

'Baptism,' either alone or in conjunction, prove nothing, unless they be accompanied with explanatory circumstances."* Again, he says: "In the time of Claude (ninth century) baptism was got down to children—not to natural infants, but to such as had begun to speak. The word infant, in this district, as in every other, was used in a vague sense for a minor."† In proof of this assertion he quotes the inscriptions on monuments over the remains of young persons of different ages, as two, thirteen, eighteen, and so on. Yet not one of the inscriptions contains the word *infant*, but all, the word *innocent*. This substitution of the one term for the other, the language being foreign, would easily mislead the careless or the unlearned reader, and on that account is the more disingenuous and culpable a ruse on the part of the author. When, in the times of which he is writing, infants are mentioned as the subjects of baptism, Robinson would have us believe that they were persons "who had begun to speak," and might have been of any age between two and eighteen or twenty-one, if that was the point at which they ceased to be minors; all which is contradicted by the very etymology of the word itself, (*in*, not, and *for*, I speak,) and to its use among all nations who have derived it from the Latin language, as denoting those who, whatever the exact number of their months or years, are not capable of speaking and acting for themselves.

For a Baptist, maintaining that immersion, and nothing else, is baptism, it is a strange admission that Robinson makes, when he says that the word baptism means nothing when alone, or when in conjunction with the word infant, unless there be some other circumstance to fix the meaning. He not only makes the concession, however, but adduces proof of its correctness, citing a passage from the code of King Liutprand, in which the guardian of a child

* Ec. Res., p. 385. † *Ibid.*, p. 469.

is allowed to *baptize* it—that is, *to chastise it with the rod or lash.* "Here," he adds, "is an infant baptism performed with a switch, without water."* The conclusion which Robinson reaches, and to which he would conduct his readers, is, that when the baptism of infants is spoken of in the times and countries in which the Waldenses lived, nothing definite can be inferred from the use of the terms; they may mean simply that the good people had their children flogged. Our readers will now understand what Professor Stuart intended by the author's "*profane levity.*"

Yet Robinson, in another place, yields a point, which, in his own view, seems decisive of the question in hand. We ask special attention to his words, which, in spite of his adroit qualifications, imply all that we could desire: "There is one general clue to the history of the baptism of babes, but how far it leads into the history of the practice of baptism among the Vaudois, must be left to each reader to imagine. Baptism is a relative institute, and all Christians consider it so. Some think it is an institute connected with a profession of Christianity, and of course it is related only to temporal Church fellowship. This is the opinion of the Baptists. Others suppose it is connected with sanctification and the pardon of sin, and related to the future state, and, consequently, that it is necessary to salvation. *If, therefore, the Vaudois held the doctrine of original sin, as it should seem they did, baptism was as necessary to their dying babes as it was to those of the Catholicks.* This is a mere conjecture, founded on theory, and such conjectures ought to have little weight, because few men reduce all parts of their own theories to practice." It is very evident that, after all his desperate expedients to overthrow the historical proofs of the rite, Robinson either was fully persuaded, or strongly suspected, that it was practiced among the Vaudois.

---

* Ec. Res., p. 386.

Jones, however, is more confidently relied on as an authority for the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses than Robinson. Indeed, his work seems to be held in the highest consideration by our Baptist brethren, as is evinced by the facts, severally, that, after going through five editions in England, it was republished in America; that it has been commended by distinguished names in their communion; and that it is the source from which their controversial writers draw the most of their statements and extracts touching the subject before us. In the body of his work, Jones does not assert, in direct terms, that the Waldenses rejected infant baptism—at least, such a declaration, if made, has escaped our notice. He does, however, what is equivalent in effect, and is even more discreditable to him as a historian—he suppresses the evidence by which the contrary might have been demonstrated. In the preface to the fifth edition of his book, issued twelve years after the first, having grown bolder, as we may presume, from the toleration of his literary crime, he vauntingly proclaims that the people of whom he wrote were anti-pedobaptists, and makes a feeble effort to substantiate his position. We shall see to what expedients he has recourse in order to make this impression.

In the treatise called "Antichrist," to which a reference has already been made, and whose antiquity and authority as an exposition of the Waldensian doctrine Jones admits, as do Perrin, Leger, Morland, and all who have duly investigated the subject, we find a protest against certain specified errors of the Romish Church. Jones quotes this document at considerable length, acknowledging himself indebted to Perrin for the copy he used. Here is a passage as found in Perrin, certain parts of which we Italicize: "The third work of 'Antichrist' is, that he *attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit to the dead outward work, baptizing children in that faith*, and teaching that thereby baptism and regeneration must be had; and therein he confers

and bestows orders and other sacraments, and groundeth therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit."* And here is the same passage, as found in Jones, professing, too, to quote from Perrin: "*He teaches to baptize children into the faith*, and *attributes to this the work of regeneration;* thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, with the external rite of baptism, and on this foundation bestows orders, and, indeed, grounds all his Christianity."† The careful reader, by examining the two versions of the passage, will be at no loss to perceive the vital difference between them, nor to surmise the purpose of Jones in the variations he has made. The former version makes the Waldensians protest against the perversion of infant baptism, as practiced among the Papists; the latter makes them protest against the ordinance itself. The one, by necessary implication, sanctions the rite; the other condemns it. Yet Jones not only had the temerity to alter the passage, when citing it in his original work, but the audacity, twelve years afterwards, to appeal to his own corrupt version in support of the error he sought to propagate.

It may be proper to state, here, that the treatise, "Antichrist," is given by Leger and Morland, as well as Perrin, and that they give the passage above cited in the same form, with a variation of a word, only, that does not affect the sense. The original of the clause, "baptizing children in that faith," is, "*bapteia le enfant en aquella fe*"—*aquella* being a demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with *fe*, and requiring the phrase to be translated *that faith*, and not admitting of Jones' rendering, *the faith*. But Jones was compelled to mistranslate the words, in order to conceal the fact that he had omitted the preceding and the governing part of the sentence. Dr. Wall, in his "History of

---

* Perrin, Book III., ch. VIII.

† Jones, Am. ed., p. 338; also Pref. to fifth English ed.

Infant Baptism,"* quotes this passage in the form in which it appears in the three authors above named. Yet in a recent work by Dr. Curtis, Professor of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, styled "The Progress of Baptist Principles," it is cited in the mulitated form in which Jones presents it, a note being appended in these words: "Jones' Church History, page 338, whose quotations I have followed, he having gone over the whole ground carefully, with Wall and Perrin before him." We have met with the passage in the same dismembered form in other writers of that school, all of whom, we charitably suppose, received it from Jones, without an examination of its authenticity. It is thus that errors are transmitted from one writer and from one generation to another, the wrong and the shame being divided between the author who originated it, and his too credulous followers.

One other instance of similar peculation on the part of Jones, and we dismiss him. He is giving an account of the faith and practices of the Waldenses in the time of Louis XII., of France, as ascertained by special inquiry, made under the instructions of that monarch. Among other things, he states that it was reported to Louis that "they kept the Sabbath day, *observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive Church*, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God."† For this incident, and the manifesto of the Waldensian doctrines and customs, Jones refers to Perrin as his authority. Turning to Perrin, we find the passage in these words: "They kept the Sabbath duly, *caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive Church*, taught them the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God."‡ Here, also, the Italics are ours. Let the reader compare the two places so designated in the two extracts. He will understand how it is that

* Vol. II., p. 242. † Page 348. ‡ Book I., ch. V.

Jones, and those who in their investigations go no farther back than to his history, can find no evidence that the Waldenses baptized their children.

But it may be asked, how does Jones dispose of the several passages which have been extracted, in the former part of this article, from the Confessions, and similar papers of the people? He simply omits them, in some instances quoting nearly the entire documents, except their testimony on this one subject. It is painful to speak in such terms of an author whom any portion of the Christian world are disposed to consider respectable. But much is due to the truth of history, and it is better that the reputation of one man should suffer, than that a whole community of Christian people, and they among the worthiest that ever existed on the earth, should lie under what they themselves pronounced a grievous calumny.

Here and there, in the writings of those who treat of the Waldenses, occur incidental remarks, which, considered apart from their connection with the particular topics to which they belong, might be construed as favoring the views of our Baptist brethren on the question at issue. The most important of these remarks is one from "Limborch's History of the Inquisition," Vol. I., ch. VIII. Jones quotes it; so does Dr. Curtis; and so, also, others of the same party. Jones, as usual, mutilates the passage. We shall, therefore, cite Dr. Curtis' more full and accurate version of it, thus: "To speak my own mind freely, the Albigenses and Waldenses appear to me to have been two distinct sects, and they were entirely ignorant of many tenets now ascribed to them. Particularly, the Waldenses appear to have been plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, and if their opinions and customs were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that, among all the modern sects of Christians, they bear the greatest resemblance to that of the Mennonites." Dr. Curtis tells us that the Mennonites are the "Modern Dutch Baptists."

It will not fail to occur to our readers that evidence of the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses must be in much request, when such as this passage affords—so meagre is it at best, and reached by so wide and toilsome a circuit—is passed down from one generation to another of controversial writers. That it really imports nothing as to the matter under discussion, we should not deem it worth the space it occupies on our pages to show, were it not that our opponents appeal to it with a confidence that stands in an exact ratio, but, as it happens, inversely, to the value of the testimony. (1.) Limborch simply offers his opinion, and this is done with an air of timidity, which implies that he was aware that the preponderance of respectable authorities was against him. (2.) He does not state, nor intimate in the most indirect terms, that the resemblance which he supposed to exist between the Waldenses and Mennonites, had any respect to infant baptism. Not a word on that subject occurs in his book, within ten pages of the passage cited from him. There are many particulars in which the two sects may have agreed, and yet infant baptism not have been included. (3.) An application of the ordinary canons of criticism would suggest to the ingenuous reader that the resemblance which he refers to, lay in the general characteristics of the parties, as plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, rather than in an agreement in any one specific article of faith or practice. And (4.) in the very chapter from which the passage is extracted, Limborch expressly exonerates the Waldenses from the charge of denying baptism to infants. In accordance with his purpose throughout the chapter, which is, to prove that the Albigenses and Waldenses were distinct sects, he classifies the opinions which he says "were common to them both," in which list nothing is said of infant baptism, and then the opinions held by the Albigenses, but not by the Waldenses. Under this latter division, he states that it was reported of the Albigenses: "That they condemned the

baptism of water, saying 'that a man was to be saved by their laying on of hands upon those that believed them, and that their sins were to be remitted without confession and satisfaction; that no baptism availed any thing; no, not their own.'" "We read, also," continues Limborch, "in the sentence of Petrus Raymundus Dominicus de Borno, that he heard Peter Auterii, (a famous doctor among the Albigenses,) teaching, among other things, 'That the baptism of water, made by the Church, was of no avail to children; because they were so far from consenting to it, that they wept.'" In connection with their views rejecting all baptism by water, Limborch enumerates various other errors, such as the sinfulness of marriage, the denial of the human nature of Christ, of the resurrection of the body, etc., in all which they betrayed their Manicheean origin, and then adds this emphatic declaration: "These opinions of the Albigenses are not one of them ascribed to the Waldenses, who had quite different tenets, which are never mentioned in the sentences of the Albigenses.* Here is Limborch's testimony as a historian. It is positive as to the opinions of the Waldenses on the subject before us, and his name may be added to the long list of authors of the highest repute, confirming our views. Or, if the passage quoted by Dr. Curtis from his pages is to be still used as implying a resemblance between the Waldenses and the Mennonites in relation to infant baptism, we oppose to it the authority of Jones himself, who says: "An impartial review of the doctrinal sentiments maintained by the Waldenses, the discipline, order, and worship of their Churches, as well as their general deportment and manner

* The Albigenses of whom Limborch speaks were not the people usually associated with the Waldenses, but a family of the Cathari, mentioned by Dr. Revel in his letter to Dr. Baird. Limborch did not make the necessary distinction between parties which it suited the purposes of Papal writers to confound together under a common name, in order that they might be subjected to a common odium.

of life, not to mention their determined and uniform opposition to the Church of Rome, affords abundant evidence of the similarity of their views and practices to those held by Luther, Calvin, and the other illustrious characters, whose labors, in the sixteenth century, contributed so eminently to effect the glorious Reformation. Most of the Catholic writers who lived about the time of the Reformation, and the age which succeeded it, clearly saw this coincidence between the principles of the Waldenses and those of the Reformers, and remarked it in their works."* If it shall be said that the matter of baptism is to be excepted in Jones' "similarity" and "coincidence," we shall claim that it be excepted, also, in Limborch's "resemblance."

Another recourse of those who would establish the antipedobaptism of the Waldenses, is, to charges preferred against them by Papal writers, and that in the days when these evangelical Christians were the objects of unremitting persecutions on account of their dissent from Papal doctrines and opposition to Papal rule. As far back as the times of Richard Baxter, and down to the present day, declarations proceeding from such a source, and originating in just such motives as the circumstances would naturally imply—declarations which the people they concern have themselves pronounced calumnious—are found bespangling the pages of our opponents in this controversy. The space which it would be proper for us to occupy will not permit the citation and review of all these precious *morceaux.* We shall confine ourselves to the examination of one, and it shall be that on which the most stress seems to be laid, if we may judge from the frequency with which it is employed. Allix mentions that Rayner, or Reinerus, a Dominican, in exposing the errors of the Waldensians, says: "Some of them hold that baptism is of no avail to infants, because they can not actually believe." Allix does not

* Jones' History, p. 357.

quote the charge as endorsing it, for, as we have seen, he held the contrary view. The sentence occurs in a long extract, covering some eight pages, in which a great many things are said by Rayner respecting the people of whom he writes, some of which were doubtless true, and others are manifestly false.

Who was this Rayner? An apostate—not from the Waldensian Church, as is sometimes asserted—but from the sect of the Cathari, with whom he had lived for seventeen years, according to his own account—"*conversatus sum cum eis.*"* Abandoning his original faith, he became a Papist, a Friar, and an Inquisitor. It was his office to search out the heresies that lurked among his former brethren, and we may reasonably suppose that he was not lacking in the zeal which usually distinguishes proselytes. He could but understand that the greater the energy he displayed in his appointed work, the kindlier would be the smiles which would cheer him from the high places of the hierarchy he served, and the more rapid his promotion. This Rayner, with such antecedents and such prospects, wrote a book; concerning whom? It seems difficult to decide. Dr. Wall, who appears to have examined the book with special care, says that he mentions the name of the Waldenses but once, and whom he means by it, Wall avers that he does not know.† Robinson says that he does not once mention the Valleys of the Piedmont, unless he meant to include them in a general description, when he said that Leonists were in all the cities of Lombardy, and had spread themselves into all countries.‡ The title of his book is "*Summa de Catharis et Leonistis.*" Now, the Cathari differed from the Waldenses more widely than the latter differed from the Papists. They revived, or else inherited, the ancient ab-

* Gieseler C. His., III., p. 395. Neander, do., IV., p. 579.

† Vol. II., pp. 254, 257.

‡ Ec. His., p. 446.

surdities and abominations of Eastern Gnosticism.* Allix says they were a sect of the Manicheeans, and, further, that "Manicheeism is the most wild heresy that the devil could ever suggest." The Leonistes, or Poor Men of Lyons, were nearly affiliated to the Waldenses, so much so as to be often mentioned as the same people. But Rayner makes no distinction between the Cathari and the Leonistes. He wished to extirpate both, and it favored his scheme to confound them, so that he could charge upon the latter all the monstrous heresies of which he knew the former to be guilty. Thus, he accuses them—both sects alike—of holding that "marriage was nothing but sworn fornication," with other sentiments too offensive to decency to be named. We know that some of the charges are utterly, foully false, as it respects the one party; and if some are false—so acknowledged by Jones, Robinson, and all writers—why may not that concerning infant baptism be false also?

In justice to Rayner, however, it should be mentioned that he does not say that the sects of which he wrote did, all of them, or the majority of them, deny infant baptism, but "*quidam eorum*," some of them. No one has ever questioned that there were in that age some small and transient sects who were liable to the charge; such, for example, as the Manicheean Cathari, who renounced all water baptism; the followers of Gundulphus, who held it useless, both for infants and adults; and, a little later, the Petrobrusians, who maintained that infants, being incapable of salvation, were also incapable of baptism. Our discussion has no reference to these sects, but to the Waldensians, who held no ecclesiastical or fraternal relations to such errorists.

We conclude this article, already unduly extended, with an extract from Richard Baxter's treatise on Baptism, in which he gives utterance to his sense of the injustice done to the Waldenses by arraigning them on charges preferred

* See Neander, or any standard Church History.

by their Papal enemies. Having referred to the testimony afforded in their own writings, that they observed the rite of infant baptism, and to the accusations of such writers as Rayner, which had been recently revived by a certain Mr. Tombes, a Baptist minister in his vicinity, the good, the saintly Baxter, exclaims: "Now, after all these clear vindications of these godly men (the Waldenses) from the malicious accusations of the Monks and Friars, who would have thought that such a man as Mr. Tombes, or any other Protestant that hath any profession of conscientiousness, should ever dare so openly to make the world believe that the malicious Papists speak truth in accusing these men; and that all our divines' vindication of them is false? Yea, and their own vindication of their own faith is false? And all this, to have somewhat to say for his own cause!! What a cause is that, that must be thus defended! Why may not Mr. Tombes as well strike in with Cope's and others' testimony against our 'Book of Martyrs,' or with the Papists in their foul lies against Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius, etc., as he doth here? Nay, would not this make the world believe that all other of the Papists' slanders of the Waldenses (as to be Arians, Manichees, Witches, Buggerers, etc.,) were true, as well as this? For, if the Papists' testimonies be better than ours, yea, or the men's own, in one thing, why not in another? * * * He that will dare to do thus, what will he not dare? And what testimony will he not think valid, that will lean on such as these? And how small a matter will satisfy him that will lean on this! * * * I pray God convince him; for bare evidence, and reason, and Scripture, will never do it, while such reasoning as this seems satisfactory or honest."*

---

* London edition, 1653, p. 159.

ARTICLE III.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

When we remember that, according to Presbyterians, the Church of God has existed, more or less visibly, in the world ever since the fall of man, and that now the people of God themselves differ as to the most radical points of Church polity, we are in danger of doubting that God has given a definite form to His House. To guard ourselves from falling into such a doubt, we may call to mind that civil government has been an object of study to the wisest and noblest of our race in all ages, and yet to-day, not only conventions and senates, but mighty armies, dispute the radical principles of constitutional liberty. But civil government *is* a science. National and civil disputes could be adjusted by reason, without appealing to the sword, were men not blinded by those lusts from which wars arise.

The subject announced at the head of this article is high—a matter, perhaps, too high for us to exercise ourselves therein. With respect to an object so complex, we fear that our thoughts will seem scarcely hinged into a skeleton, yet it is our earnest desire that these thoughts may correspond to reality, and thus be *truth*, and that they may form, though a rude, yet a truthful, sketch of the "true Tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man." If, as a branch of the catholic Church, we are correct in saying: "The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate," this government must be some thing comprehensible by these officers. Its constitution and laws they may understand. And though, as one of these officers, we may fail to reach

this height, we may comfort ourselves with the saying: *In magnis voluisse sat est.*

This magnitude of Church government, as an object of thought, and its consequent difficulty, to some extent accounts for the imperfection of our knowledge of this object. But we may find another reason in the nature of language—the relation of language to thought. Here let us step aside from the direct path to pluck a flower—a flower not so much of expression as of thought: "Admitting, even, that the mind is capable of certain elementary concepts, without the fixation and signature of language, still these are but sparks, which would twinkle only to expire; and it requires words to give them prominence, and, by enabling us to collect and elaborate them into new concepts, to raise, out of what would only be scattered and transitory scintillations, a vivid and enduring light." The languages of the Church were first Hebrew, then Greek, after that chiefly Latin, and now, with us, English. From these changes of language, and our imperfect knowledge of them, they have failed to yield us a vivid and enduring light—to give us a *science* of the Church. The twinkling and expiring sparks of thought have not sufficed to reveal the symmetry and beauty, the order, firmness, and duration of the Christian temple.

Assuming, at present, some principles held, with a noble loyalty to Christ, by Presbyterians, for centuries—principles baptized with the blood of martyrs—we will briefly consider the courts of the Church; how they are created; their powers; their number; their mutual relations; their relation to the State. Since, according to Presbyterians, ruling powers, strictly, are vested by Christ exclusively in those courts, the full and complete consideration of the points now mentioned would involve the entire subject of Church polity.

These courts may be said to be created by the people who are subject to their rule, because each member of a

court is elected by the people he represents. "Though the character, qualifications, and authority of Church officers are laid down in the Holy Scriptures, as well as the proper method of their investiture and institution, yet the election of the persons to the exercise of this authority, in any particular society, is in that society." Thus, though the constitution and laws of the Church, and the powers of Church officers, come down from heaven, the officers themselves arise from the people, being chosen out of the people, and by them.

This theory, that the Church, catholic or national, grows from the people—grows by particular churches voluntarily uniting with other particular churches, and thus forming more general churches—exhibiting a more extensive visible unity among the followers of Christ, is of importance at the present time, because some seem to think that new and local churches spring into existence at the bidding of some great central court, and that the new church derives its constitution, laws, and life, almost, from this previously existing Church. What else does Dr. Baird mean, (Digest, Part VI.,) where he says: "From the facts presented below, it will appear that the General Assembly is not a body created by the voluntary union of Presbyteries and Synods, as is some times assumed, but itself the original body whence they have derived their existence and powers"? We say No, to this. The new Synod, Presbytery, or Session, derives its existence, powers, and life, as directly from Christ, as the Assembly did. It is the voluntary union of smaller courts which forms a larger court.

We know the language of the Constitution may seem to favor the opposite theory. The General Assembly is said to have the power "of erecting new Synods." The Synod has the power "to erect new Presbyteries." The Presbytery has power "to form or receive new congregations." This language of our constitution may be illustrated by the commission of the Prophet Jeremiah: "See, I have set

thee this day over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant." The Prophet is said to do what he only declares God would do. Thus, an existing church may, without abuse of language, be said to erect or create a new church, when it declares, with authority from Christ, the terms of admission into the kingdom of Christ, and receives the new church into visible union with itself.

To illustrate the principle, let us take a case which is frequently occurring, the organization of a new congregation. A Presbytery sends forth an evangelist, with power to preach to a people, and organize them into a church, upon their credible profession of Christianity. The minister proclaims to the people the existence of the kingdom of Christ, its ineffable blessings and glories, and the terms of admission. This new people believe, and signify their desire to enter the kingdom; their names are enrolled, and they elect their officers. Now, so far as the agency of man is concerned, who is it that erects, forms, or creates this new church? The evangelist? the Presbytery who sent him? or the new people themselves? We think it is the last. And the officers to govern this church may be said to be created by the people that elect them, though the powers they are to exercise have been prescribed in the constitution and laws which Christ has given to the catholic Church.

This may be predicated of every court above—the Session, the Presbytery, Synod, and the General Assembly. Of each court, even of the Assembly, it may be said it was created by the people whom it was intended to govern; but the constitution, defining the powers of the court and the laws to be administered, are from Christ.*

---

* With great respect for our correspondent, we submit that the courts of the Church can not, in any just sense, be said to be *created* by the people.

Touching the formation of Church courts, we may adopt the language of a former number of the Review, (Vol. XII., No. 3): "The Presbytery is a union of Sessions—the Synod is a union of Presbyteries—and the General Assembly is, or ought to be, a union of Synods." Making the Assembly a union of Synods would be more regular—more symmetrical. Indeed, we may regard this as a fact. True, in the United States Assembly, the ratio of representation is made by the Presbyteries, and the amending power is vested in the Presbyteries; but the roll in the Assembly is called by Synods; the Assembly was at first constituted out of four Synods; the Assembly reviews the records of Synods, not those of Presbyteries; the Assembly has power to erect new Synods, the Synod to erect new Presbyteries. The Constitution of the United States divides each State into Congressional Districts, and assigns to each District a representative; yet the Federal Government is, or was, a union of States, not of Districts. Then, why not say that the Assembly is a union of Synods? This theory, had it been

---

The mere election of the members, severally, is not the creation of the body.

So, also, we submit that the people who have been organized as a new church by the evangelist, or by the Presbytery, can not be said to *create* that church nor its officers. Such a people do but *compose* the church, and they but *elect* the officers.

Touching the meaning of Dr. Baird, in the passage quoted by our correspondent from his Digest, we understand him to be speaking simply in a *historical* sense. The actual rise of the General Assembly was antecedent to the formation of all but sixteen of the Presbyteries, and all but four of the Synods. In the organism of "the Presbyterian Church in the United States," the General Assembly was, as to all the Synods and Presbyteries, with the above named exceptions, the *root*, in a *historical* aspect, out of which the inferior courts arose.

Upon several other points in this interesting and suggestive article, we would take issue with our correspondent, but it is the first time he has ventured upon our hospitality, and as we desire to secure his returning to visit us again, we wish to be very civil. Our readers must give their candid consideration to his views.—[EDS. S. P. R.

generally adopted and followed by Southern Presbyterians, in the dissolution and reorganization now going on, would have prevented much confusion—would have added *majesty* to the movement. With what dignity could the Synod of South Carolina, for sufficient cause, have declared the dissolution of its governmental union with the Synods of the United States—a union effected through the Assembly! Then this Synod could have met other Southern Synods on the platform of a constitution which the Synods, in the order of nature, if not of time, had before there *was* an Assembly.

Southern Presbyterians, recognizing the Confederate Assembly to be a union of Synods, may improve the system of reports. They may ignore the unconstitutional order of the United States Assembly, requiring reports from the Presbyteries directly to the Assembly. We know by experience the confusion this order has produced, especially in congregational reports. We have thus considered, briefly, the manner in which Church courts are originated. But there is a question logically prior to this.

Presbyterians say that governmental power—distinguished from the power of teaching, and from the pregnant right of election, which is secured to the people—is vested in a grand system of courts. This system consists of thousands of Congregational councils, each equal in power and dignity with every other Session. Next comes the grade of Presbyteries, each having a jurisdiction limited geographically, and by a written constitution. Such is the union of similitude between these Presbyteries, that the definition of one fits every other. Next are the Synods, and, finally, a supreme court, called the General Assembly.

Now, the question is, is this form of government a human constitution, or is it divine? The language of our Fathers is modest: "We hold it to be expedient, and agreeable to Scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the Church be governed by Congrega-

tional, Presbyterial, and Synodical Assemblies." They cite some passages from the New Testament, to show that this form is Scriptural. But on the principle, which is eminently Presbyterian, that God has never established but one catholic visible Church, we think that light may be thrown from other points upon the Church, to reveal its form. The Christian Church is the succession and perpetuation of the Abrahamic and the Mosaic. A law once enacted is in force until repealed. This is the foundation of infant membership in these last days. But when we quote any constitution or law of the Mosaic Church, as a precedent for present practice, we are likely to be met with the objection: That law was political—it was judicial, or it was ceremonial—not moral, and binding upon us. But we think that "the form of the house" under the Mosaic dispensation, as to *government*, is a grand type to us.

That we may see the relation of the Mosaic government to modern Church polity, let us quote a passage in this Review, Vol. XIII., p. 44. Here is announced what is termed the great law of differentiation. To illustrate this law, on the next page it is said: "In proportion as society advances, differentiation of social character, and specialization of social functions (division of labor) progresses also, until, in the highest conditions of society, each man is confined to the performance of a single function."

Now, this great law of differentiation finds an illustration in the most dignified of all departments of human activity—in government. We will attempt an illustration. What unity of power—what a combination of social functions—do we see in Abraham! His family, including his servants, formed a tribe or nation, and was, also, primarily the visible Church. In this society Abraham was at once the principal instructor and the High Priest, performing the most solemn acts of the priesthood—he was king, judge and jury, and was a successful military chieftain.

In Egypt we find some division of power, because there were elders over the people. But the Mosaic government was a great advance in differentiation. The functions of sacrificing and of teaching were given to the Priests and Levites. As to government, the whole nation was divided into twelve tribes—the tribes were subdivided into great families—and these, again, were subdivided into less families, called houses of fathers (Num. 1: 2). There was not much consolidation in the government. There was much local self-government. The chief magistrate, at first called judge, then king, was a limited monarch. He was debarred, by a strict constitution, from absolutism.

Yet there was much unity of power. Especially, the ecclesiastical and civil powers were not separated. The ecclesiastical and civil laws were intermingled in the same books. There is not satisfactory evidence that there were two sets of courts, one for Church cases, the other for civil causes. The High Priest, the chief minister of divine worship, was the President of the supreme court. David, in whose reign the Mosaic government culminated, was a lawgiver to the Church, the king of the country, the sweet Psalmist of Israel, and the greatest military chieftain of his time.

It was not until after the advent of Christ that governmental powers were divided into two great classes, and the Church and State became two separate, independent, and coördinate organizations.

The powers of civil government have been divided and subdivided, so as to make a complex and refined organism, according to the maxim: without division of power there is no constitution; without constitution, no liberty. This division was made by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, with an approach towards perfection, we hope, now, in our blessed Confederacy. There is a triple division of these powers—those delegated to the Confederacy; those to the State governments; and those which

the people still retain, not having delegated them to either government. Among the powers retained by the people of the several States, is the high sovereign power by which they ordained and established both State and Federal governments, and by which they can modify, change, or abolish them at pleasure.

Let us quote a passage here from Mr. Calhoun's work on Government, to illustrate the division of power in the Government of the United States: "Taking all the parts together, the people of thirty independent and sovereign States, confederated, by a solemn constitutional compact, into one great federal community, with a system of government, in all of which, powers are separated into the great primary divisions of the constitution-making and the law-making powers; those of the latter class being divided between the common and joint government of all the States, and the separate and local governments of each State respectively; and, finally, the powers of both distributed among three separate and independent departments, legislative, political, and executive—presents in the whole a political system as remarkable for its grandeur as it is for its novelty and refinement of organization. For the structure of such a system—so wise, just, and beneficent—we are far more indebted to a superintending Providence, that so disposed events as to lead, as if by an invisible hand, to its formation, than to those who erected it. Intelligent, experienced, patriotic, as they were, they were but builders under its superintending direction."*

As to division of powers in ecclesiastical government—as to constitutional guaranties from oppression—the system may be simpler than in the State; for the officers have, substantially, but one everlasting code to which they can require obedience. This, of itself, is a mighty wall of sal-

---

* Page 198.

vation from ecclesiastical tyranny, where the people are not too ignorant or careless to perceive it.

The distinction between the constitution-making and law-making powers, is not of so much consequence in the kingdom of Christ. Church courts, according to Presbyterians, have only judicial and executive powers, and there is much less danger of oppression from the right of judging upon laws already made, than from "the usurped claim of making laws."

True, we speak of the power of a majority of Presbyteries to amend the Constitution, and of our courts legislating; but the products in either case are only *judge-made* laws. They are laws evolved from a written system by judicial interpretation—"by good and necessary consequence."

To return nearer to the question in hand: Can we use the Mosaic form of government as a great type of instruction, at least in erecting "the true Tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man?" or as a light to show us what this Tabernacle is? We think so.

We can not now enter upon a lengthy argumentation to prove this. We will only say, that the visible Church was not disorganized at the advent of Christ—the form of government was not abolished; great alterations were made in the mode of worship, and there was a great extension of the blessings of the Church; but the inspired Apostles, saying nothing of a revolution in ecclesiastical government, vesting its powers in Presbyteries, some local, and at least one—which was sufficient for the time—supreme court; all this affords a strong probability of a perpetuation of the Mosaic form of goverment. For that government, being primarily ecclesiastical, and only secondarily civil, it is more properly an example to the Church than to the State.

Now, the basis of the Mosaic economy was the division of the people into four ranks of communities. The primary communities were termed "houses of fathers." A

union of these formed a family. A union of families, a tribe. A union of the twelve tribes formed the nation, or Church of God. Corresponding with these, the prefects, or judges, advised by Jethro, were of four ranks. The analogy of our form of government to the Israelitish is obvious, and the more, when it is remembered that both governments are only judicial and executive upon divine laws.

And for this reason, the analogy of our Presbyterian government is with the judicial system of this country, rather than with the legislative. And a government of courts, ascending from the primary and local to the larger and more general, and ending in one supreme, seems to be founded in nature. It satisfies two great principles, that the accused be tried as near his home as convenient, or near the scene of the facts to be investigated; and that the more difficult cases may ascend where they may be adjudicated by the greatest wisdom of the system. In every country where the people enjoy constitutional liberty, there is such a system of courts.

The formation of a grand central court, as our General Assembly, is in beautiful harmony with one of the chief ends of the organization of the Church. This chief end is, the execution of the order: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." This is a great work, requiring the coöperation of all the people of God, united and represented by an Assembly. And this is analogous to the fact of civil government, that there are certain great powers which can be successfully executed only by a federal government.

We think the opinion of Presbyterians, that the form of Church government is divine, and that that form is a system of courts having judicial and executive powers, may receive confirmation from a new source. We believe that our views are in harmony with the great laws of "typical forms and special ends," so fully illustrated by McCosh. The one, "typical forms," as well as the other, "special

ends," will be found in the dispensations of God *in the kingdom of His Son*, and point to a most interesting analogy between nature and revelation.

To apply these laws to the topic in hand: God gave His people, through Moses, a *form* of government, which is typical to His Church now, though that form was modified, especially at the coming of Christ, to suit a grander field of operations. It would result from this that we can not now comprehend the "true Tabernacle" without recurring to the Old Testament. And this harmonizes with the words of the Apostle: "The *law* was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." We must yet consult Moses for law and forms of government. But we can not pursue this thought now, for we can not make this article exhaustive; we shall be satisfied if it prove suggestive.

There is an application of a principle in a preceding paragraph we desire to make. The principle is, that the visible Church grows into visible unity, by the voluntary union of particular churches, to form more general churches. Thus, a General Assembly is created by local bodies. Let us connect with this another principle, that visible or governmental union, however important, is not essential to Christian character. The necessity of the visible union of believers in one organization, is one of the chief errors of the Papacy. This visible union of all the professors of Christianity, Papists said, could only be effected through the Pope; and without it a man could not be saved. But we distinguish between the union of the invisible Church and that of the visible. The former union is essential to salvation, and indissoluble. The latter is not. And, in the present state of the world, it is, perhaps, not possible to extend the governmental union of a Church beyond the limits of a nation. Then, the fact of the formation of the Southern Confederacy, and that for reasons we heartily approve, is an adequate cause for dissolving—not spiritual

union with Northern Presbyterians, if they are Christians—but external governmental union.

True, three centuries since, Scotch Presbyterians contemplated an Assembly representing and visibly uniting all Presbyterians in all nations under the heavens. This may occur in the Millenium, but it is a sublimity to which we can not at present aspire.

Let us close this article, in which our thoughts have not been connected with a golden chain, by reminding our readers of the *importance* of the subject, and especially now.

Constitutions and forms of government, in Church and State, are among the most complex and difficult, yet the most ennobling and important, objects of thought. For the subjects of a large part of history are usurpations of unjust and unconstitutional power, and consequent oppression; the subject of nearly all the other part of history is resistance to usurpation, calling into play the most godlike virtues of our nature.

And our Southern Zion is amply justified in her profound sympathy with our Confederacy in the bloody conflict for constitutional liberty. Boasting of a complete separation of Church and State, we may forget how intimate is the relation of these divine institutions, and how powerful is their mutual influence. Civil and ecclesiastical tyranny have ever been closely combined. On the other hand, constitutional liberty in the Church, tends to bring about constitutional liberty in the country. And this, in its turn, has the most happy influence upon the Church, which never flourished extensively, and for a long period, where despotism prevailed. This conflict, then, is not merely for temporal advantages, but for the noblest opportunities for spiritual and eternal life.

ARTICLE IV.

ANALOGY BETWEEN THE FORMATION OF THE PIHEL CONJUGATION IN HEBREW AND THE PERFECT TENSE IN LATIN.

The Pihel conjugation in Hebrew is *intensive*, and, like the frequentative verbs in Latin, such as *dictito*, *ventito*, *cantito*, from *dico*, *venio*, *cano*, "is formed by reduplicating one of the letters of the root; on the principle that, as the repetition of a sentence or of a word imparts a greater degree of energy to discourse, so the reduplication of even a part of a word may be employed with like effect. The letter selected for reduplication is generally the second radical, whereby the greatest degree of force is obtained; since this letter can thus be made audible in both syllables, which is not the case with either of the others." The roots generally consist of three consonants, and this is the regular way of forming the conjugation, but in case some obstacle arises, in the nature of the radicals, to the carrying out of this law, then some other expedient is resorted to, by way of compensation.

The principle is, that the peculiar idea of the conjugation must be carried out by protracting some part of the root; and if the right radical will not admit of it, it takes another, "which will serve instead, and at the same time show that the second radical would have been reduplicated, had this not been forbidden by its nature."

This is accomplished in three separate ways:

1. The first vowel is lengthened, especially when the second radical is a guttural, since the dwelling longer upon a syllable, by lengthening it, confers an emphasis equivalent to the forcible expulsion of the voice in reduplicating a consonant.

The verb to kill, *katal*, is regular, and forms this conjugation by doubling the *t* and changing the vowel before it; it then becomes *kittal*, to kill often, in which the *a* has the sound of a in sale. But when the middle letter is a guttural, or r, which is of the same nature, and can not so easily be doubled, to compensate for it, the vowel before it is lengthened; *barak*, instead of becoming *birrāk*, is *bārāk*, but the vowels differing from the root, in that both have here the sound of a in sale.

2. When the second radical is *vav* (v, w), on account of the weakness of this letter, the *third* is doubled in its stead, and v rests in its homogeneous vowel, o—*e. g.*, *komam*, for *kivvam*.

3. When the second letter is *repeated* in the root, the first is reduplicated in the intensive form—*e. g.*, *sabab* becomes *sisbāb*, which, by transposition, becomes *sibsāb*, the *a* having, as before, the sound of a in sale.*

Now, we apply the same principle to the preterite of the Latin verb, to express "the state consequent upon the completion of an action."

It seems to have been a law here, too, that the peculiar idea of this tense shall be expressed by lengthing something pertaining to the root. There must be a *prefix*, an *affix*, on an internal prolongation of the *vowel* of the root. Of these methods, it may be difficult to tell which is the regular and normal one, answering to the doubling of the middle radical consonant of the Hebrew; but probably the reduplication of the first consonant is, after the analogy of the Greek, where this is the rule, with few exceptions; as, when a verb begins with a double consonant, with any two single ones, except a mute before a liquid, or with *γν*; as *ζάω*, *ἔζηκα*; *ψάλλω*, *ἔψαλκα*; *στέλλω*, *ἔσταλκα*, etc.

We may not be able to see, in every case that the reduplication does not occur, the reason of it, but in many cases

* See Nordheimer's Heb. Gram., §§ 142, 143.

the same reason will hold as in the Hebrew; and the same classes of letters do not reduplicate the gutturals, with r in general, and v, and those hard to enunciate, or not euphonic. The reduplication is confined to the third conjugation of verbs, which is believed *to have been the original one*, as the third declension of nouns is the parent of all the others. As authority for this opinion with regard to conjugations, Anthon, in his Latin Prosody, refers to Struve.*

The only consonants admitting reduplication, according to Pott (Etym. F., p. 23), are c, p, t, d, m, b, f, st, sp, etc.; as *cado, ce-cid-i; pello, pepuli; tango* (root *tag*), *te-tig-i; do, de-di; mordeo, mo-mordi; fallo, fe-falli; sto, steti; spondeo, spospondi; scindo, scidi*, for *sci-cid-i*. Harrison says: "It should be remarked that the radical of the reduplicated perfect is uniformly short, and that if it has been increased in the present and similar tenses by the addition of a consonant, the root in the perfect recovers its simple form."† The Latin had no gutturals properly, and we miss from the above list the palatics, g, q, j, which come the nearest to gutturals, with the weak consonant, v and r, together with h, which, though called an aspirate, must have had, in some cases at least, like *hē* and *hhēth* in Hebrew, a guttural sound; as we see in *veho, vexi*, (*vecsi*); *traho, traxi*, (*tracsi*). So that, on the whole, we shall see that, though more letters are not doubled in Latin than in Hebrew, the same that fail to be reduplicated in the latter are not in the former.

We will proceed to show, then, the strong analogy between the methods of forming the Pihel conjugation in Hebrew and the perfect tense in Latin. As, in the former, we have the regular formation by reduplicating the first syllable of the root, generally with a change of the short vowel, just as with the vowel preceding the letter doubled

---

* Ueber die Lateinische Declination und Conjugation, Königsberg, 1823.
† Harrison's Lat. Gr., p. 251.

in Hebrew—*e. g.*, *katal*, *kittal*, "*the first being accompanied by the shortest vowel*, *i*, by means of which the reduplication of the letter following can be the most forcibly expressed"—so *fallo* makes *fĕfalli; tango*, (root *tag*, the n merely strengthening the present,) *tĕtĭgi; cado*, *cĕcĭdi; parco*, *pĕpĕrci. Sto* (Gr. *ΣΤΑΩ*, hence an *a* belongs to the root,) *stĕti*, and, compounded, *constĭti.* But when this mode of formation is not, or can not be, for some reason, carried out, it is compensated for:

(1.) By intensifying the radical vowel. *Facio*, *fēc-i; video*, *vīd-i; venio*, *vēn-i; lavo*, *lāv-i; jacio*, *jēc-i:* here, in each case, the first vowel of the root is short, but is lengthened in the perfect; hence the rule of prosody, that preterites of two syllables lengthen the former. We think that this explanation is more simple than that of Grimm, who contends that such verbs originally had a reduplication, and lost it in the course of time. Thus, *venio*, *veveni*, *ve'eni*, *veni; video*, *vividi*, *vi'idi*, *vidi; fugio*, *fufugi*, *fu'ugi*, *would be the process of contraction.**

(2.) We have an addition to the end of the word. This may be *ui*, *vi*, or *si*. *Habeo*, *habui; Amo*, *amavi; Angeo*, *anxi* (*angsi*). The *ui*, and *vi*, are only different forms of the same thing.

(3.) We may have a long vowel, with this ending in *si* added, and one of the consonants of the root dropped. *Mitto*, *mīsi*, (*mitsi*); *Rodo*, *rōsi*, (*rodsi*); *Rado*, *rasi*, (*radsi*). In some cases the consonant is retained, but assimilates to the termination; *cedo cessi*, instead of *cedsi.*† *Premo*, *pressi.* But *defendo*, *defendi*, in which the s in *si* is rejected. There is no case of reduplication when a letter is already repeated in the root, by which I mean all that precedes—are—ere—ire—of the infinitive; *bibo*, *vivo*, *ningo*, *gigno*, have *bibi*, *vixi*, *ninxi*, *genui.*

---

* Anthon's Lat. Pros., pp. 16, 17.

† This seems a singular case of *d* going into *s*.

If the above supposition is not an approximation to the truth, and the reduplicated perfect is not the normal form, from which the others deviate, for certain reasons arising from the nature of the letters and the laws of euphony, then there can be no regular system, and the language exhibits a very irregular and composite character. Zumpt (Gram., sec. 154) calls this form of the perfect an "*irregularity.*"*

And if the case of the Latin is illustrated by the Hebrew, the question arises, has the former at any time, at its origin or since, been influenced by the latter, or are these compensatory variations the results of the laws that relate to the human mind, and the organs of speech? From the relation, or, rather, want of relation, in ancient times between these two people, it is not probable that the language of one influenced that of the other, either in its vocabulary, in the formation and inflection of words, or in grammatical construction. Any similarity, then, must arise from the same circumstances, and the same laws of mental and physical constitution.

Comparative philologists put these two languages in very diverse families. And "what influence the Semitic family, especially the religionized Judaic portion of it, has had, directly or indirectly, on the developement of any or all of the Indo-European family, it would be a matter of capital interest, were there sufficient data for such an examination, to investigate and decide."†

---

* The ethnical affinities * * * * satisfactorily established by the investigations of Niebuhr, Müller, Lepsius, Donaldson, and others, are a guide to the affinities of the Latin language, and point out the elements of which it is composed. These elements are Umbrian, Oscan, Etruscan, Sabine, and Pelasgian; but the Etruscan was a compound of Oscan and Pelasgian, and the Sabine was the link between the Umbrian and Oscan, therefore the elements of the Latin are reduced to three, viz: Umbrian, Oscan, and Pelasgian.—Browne's Rom. Class. Lit., pp. 42, 43.

† Modern Philology, by Dwight, p. 25.

As the perfect tense in Latin also performs the office of an aorist, or indefinite past, some are disposed to say that those perfects that add *si* were originally aorists, and that this termination corresponds with the Greek ending *sa*. *E-tup-sa*, *nup-si*, and *tur-si*, have a great resemblance. And the resemblance is equally great in the case of liquid verbs in Greek, that lengthen the penult and add *a* to the termination, as, *mĕno*, 1st aor., *ĕ-mein-a; nĕmo*, 1st aor., *ĕ-neim-a;* and those Latin verbs that form the perfect by adding *i* only, and lengthening the penult, as *vĭdeo*, *vīdi; ago*, *ēgi; fra(n)go*, *frēgi*.

Latham says: "when a difference of form has ceased to express a difference of meaning, it has become superfluous. This is the case with the two forms (the reduplicated perfect, *tetigit*, and the one in *si*, as *vixit*.) One of them may be dispensed with; and the consequence is, that, although in the Latin language both the perfect and aorist forms are found, they are, with few exceptions, never found in the same word. Wherever there is the perfect, the aorist is wanting, and *vice versâ*. The two ideas, *I have struck*, and *I struck*, are merged into the notion of past time in general, and are expressed by one of two forms, some times by that of the Greek perfect, and some times by that of the Greek aorist. On account of this, the grammarians have cut down the number of Latin tenses to *five;* forms like *cucurri* and *vixi* being dealt with as one and the same tense. The true view is, that in *curso* the aorist form is replaced by the perfect, and in *vixi* the perfect form is replaced by the aorist.

ARTICLE V.

THE PERSONALITY OF GOD, AS AFFECTING SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Simonides, the poet, when questioned by Hiero, the king, concerning the nature of God, demanded a day for consideration. The question being repeated at the expiration of the time, he begged to be allowed two days longer, and after having frequently evaded an answer, by still prolonging the period of deliberation, the king at length demanded the reason of this strange procedure. Simonides, who was a philosopher as well as a poet, gave the pregnant reply, that the longer he thought upon the subject, the greater was the difficulty of a satisfactory answer. Obscurities multiplied to reflection. "Behold, God is great," says Job, "and we know Him not, neither can the number of His years be searched out." The inscription upon the altar at Athens, which furnished Paul with a text for his memorable sermon on Mars Hill, contains a confession of ignorance, which can never cease to be true until God ceases to be infinite, and we the creatures of a day. He must ever be, not only the unknown, but the unknowable God. "Canst thou, by searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea."

In striking contrast with these representations of antiquity we have a modern statement, that the very essence of God is comprehensibility—that it is His nature to be known, and that only in so far as He is intelligible, can He be said to have real existence.

To explain how such contradictory conclusions have been arrived at, we must understand the problem which, from the dawn of speculation, philosophy has set herself to solve, and the methods by which she has conducted the investigation. The point has been, to unfold the mystery of the universe—to tell whence it came, and how it has been produced. Being in itself and being in its laws—the causes and principles of all existing things, the great master of ancient speculation makes to be the end and aim of that science which he dignifies as wisdom. It is clear that, in every inquiry into causes and principles, the final answer must be, God. He is preëminently the Being from whom all other beings spring, and the constitution of the universe must be referred to Him as the ground and measure of its existence. In this general answer, which resolves every thing at last into God, every philosophy which deserves the name, whether in ancient or modern times, has concurred. They all end in Him. But when they undertake to answer the further question, what He is, and how all things centre in Him, they come to different results, according to their different views of the nature of the universe, and its relation to its first principle, or cause.

According to Aristotle, those who first philosophized on the subject, directed their attention to the principle of things, defining a principle as that of which all things are, out of which they are first generated, and into which they are at last corrupted, the essence remaining, though changed in its affections. What this essence was, this nature of things, whether one or many, the philosophers were not agreed. The language employed by Aristotle in recounting early opinions, and the subsequent history of philosophy, suggest different views of the nature of the universe. 1. It may be regarded as an organic whole, similar to the body of an animal or the structure of a plant; and, then, as the law of its being would be simply that of developement, we could easily explain its phenomena, if we could only

seize upon the germ, from which it was gradually unfolded. The inquiry, in this aspect, is into the αρχη, the seminal principle, and its law of manifestation and of growth. Given this principle, in itself and in its law of operation, and the problem of the universe is solved. You find God, who is at once the commencement and the complement of being. 2. Or the universe may be regarded as a complex whole, a unity made by composition and mixture, consisting of parts entirely distinct in themselves, and held together by some species of cohesion. In this aspect the problem is, what are the elements of which it is compounded, and how are they sustained in union and combination? The answer here might be atheistic or not, according as the doctrine of efficient causes was excluded or rejected. The ancient arguments for Theism proceeded, for the most part, upon this conception of the universe, and postulated the necessity of a designing mind and a controlling Providence upon the arrangements of matter. The universe was a vast and complicated machine, which required mind to construct it, and mind to regulate its movements. Or, 3. The universe may be regarded as absolutely an unit, a single being, whose essence or nature determines its phenomena, as if by logical necessity. There is a something which is the substratum of all properties—in which they inhere, and from which they are derived, as qualities are dependent upon substance, and when this essence, which is synonymous with being, has been discovered, we have found God. He is the essence of all things. They are only manifestations or properties of His infinite substance. This, it is needless to add, is the most ancient form of the philosophy of the absolute.

Modern schools of philosophy have pursued essentially the same tracks in explaining the mysteries of being. The most striking difference is, not in relation to the problem to be solved, but in relation to the point from which the investigation takes its departure. Ancient speculation

fastened on the objective and material, and its principles and causes were primarily, as Aristotle remarks, in the species of matter. Modern speculation begins with consciousness, and, confounding thought with existence, reality with knowledge, has made the laws of thought the regulative and constitutive principles of being. God is nothing but the complement of primitive cognitions—the collection of those fundamental ideas which are involved in every act of spontaneous consciousness, and whose nature it is, not only to be intelligible, but to furnish the conditions of the intelligibility of every thing besides. The characteristic of all the systems, whether ancient or modern, which makes God figure at the head of their various theories, as cause, principle, or law, and which resolve all phenomena into manifestation, combination, or development, is the stern necessity to which they reduce every thing. Pantheism and Positivism, how much soever they may differ in other respects, unite in the denial of a personal God. They consequently exclude, with equal rigor, the possibility of morals and religion, and shift the grounds of the certainty of science. It is the personal God, whose name we regard with awe and veneration, whose throne is encircled with clouds and darkness, and who must for ever be the unknown God. He is the great mystery which, once admitted, throws light upon every thing but the depths of His own being. He is the Infinite One who, transcending all the categories of thought, and mocking the limits of all finite science, can only be adored as a Being past finding out. He is the God whom human nature has spontaneously acknowledged. It is a corrupt philosophy, not the dictates of humanity—a spirit of bold and presumptuous speculation, and not the instinctive voice of the human spirit—that has replaced Him with a law, a principle, or an element. So radical and all-pervading is this truth of the personality of God, so essential

to all the dearest interests of man, that we propose to make it the subject of a more distinct consideration.

I. It may be well to begin by explaining what is involved in the notion of a *personal God.* What is it, in other words, to be a person?

A definition of a simple and primitive belief is not to be expected. We may describe the occasions on which it is elicited in consciousness, or the conditions on which it is realized, but the thing itself is incapable of being represented in thought. We have, for example, a belief of power and of substance, and we can detail the circumstances under which the belief is felt; but power and substance, we are incompetent to define; they are, to us, the unknown causes of effects which we experience. So it is with person; what it is in itself, what constitutes and distinguishes it, we can not comprehend—but there are conditions on which the belief of it, as the unknown and inexplicable cause of obvious phenomena, is developed in consciousness. These conditions, as the necessary adjuncts of the natural and spontaneous belief, we are able to apprehend.

1. The first circumstance which distinguishes this notion, is that of individuality. The notion is developed only under the antithesis of some thing different from itself, which takes place in every act of consciousness. Every instance of knowledge is the affirmation of a self, on the one hand, and a some thing which is not self, on the other. There is the subject knowing, and the object known. A man believes his own existence, only in believing the existence of somewhat that is distinct from himself. He affirms his personality, in contrast with another and a different reality. When, therefore, we assert the personality of God, we mean to affirm that He is distinct from other beings, and from other objects. We mean to affirm that He is not the universe, either in its matter or form, its seminal principle or final development.

He is essentially separate from it. His substance is in no sense the substance of the things that we see. He might have existed, and through a past eternity did exist, without them. They are objects to Him as a subject—no more parts of His own being than the material world is a part of ourselves. This notion of individuality is essential to every conception of the Deity, which enables him to use the pronoun I. An absolute Being can not be a person. The God of Pantheism can not say, "I will," or "I know"—and the notion of such a being ever reaching the stage of what the absolute philosophers call self-consciousness, is a flagrant contradiction in terms. When subject and object are identified, there can be no consciousness, no knowledge. When they are carried up to indifference, the result is personal extinction.

2. But, though individuality is a necessary adjunct of the notion of person, it is not always a necessary sign of its existence. There may be individuals that are not persons. The trees which we see around us, the plants and animals that cover the surface of the globe, are all individuals, but they are not persons. There are other conditions essential to the developement of the notion; these may be reduced to two—intelligence and will—or intelligence and conscience. Self is affirmed only in consciousness, and consciousness is the property only of intelligence. A being that can not reflect, and attribute its thoughts or impressions to itself, that can not say, "I think," "I feel," "I believe," can not be regarded as a person. It is probable that the brute has no reflective consciousness. He has present states, but does not distinguish, in the spontaneous feeling, the antithesis of subject and object. This is, possibly, the condition of infancy, also. But the dignity and full significancy of the notion of person, are developed in the sphere of morals—in which man is regarded as the subject of rights, and the responsible author of his own actions—to be a person, is to be one who can

regulate his motions according to a law, and who feels that there are certain things which he can justly claim as his own. He who can say, "I have a right," evinces himself, in the highest sense, to be a true and proper person. Hence, as morals are conversant only about voluntary states and acts, the doctrine has become common, that personality is seated exclusively in the will—but this narrow and restricted view puts asunder what God has joined together. Intelligence and responsibility can never be divorced, and though it is in the sphere of duties and of rights that the importance of self becomes most conspicuous, yet the simplest act of knowledge can not possibly take place without the recognition of it.

3. Another thing, equally essential to self-hood, is the feeling of absolute simplicity. It can not be divided, or separated into parts. Consciousness is an unit—responsibility is an unit. Every person is not only separate from every other being, but is incapable of discerption in himself.

When, therefore, we maintain the personality of God, we mean distinctly to affirm that He is an absolutely simple intelligence, possessed of consciousness and will, who acts from purpose, and from choice, and is not to be confounded with any of the creatures of His hand. He is not a blind fatality; not a necessary principle; not a necessary law. He has every attribute which we recognize in ourselves as beings of reason and of will. It is preëminently in our personality, and the qualities which perfect and adorn it, that the image of God consists, in which man was originally formed, and this is the immense chasm betwixt us and the other creatures that inhabit this globe.

The plant has life and sensibility—the brute is capable of perception and motion, and exhibits, perhaps, some rude traces of dawning intelligence. But neither plants nor brutes have any thing approximating to the feeling of self-consciousness. Neither can rise to the affirmation of

a self, and neither is the subject of rights or duties. But to man it belongs to say, "I," "Me," and in this respect he resembles the God that made him. But, while the essence of the Divine image consists in the property of personality, the perfection of that image consists in the knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, which invest a person with all its dignity and excellence. All retain the essence—none but the redeemed have now the qualities that adorn. It is still true that God has set His eternal canon against murder, because the life which is violently taken away is the property of him who, as a person, still resembles his Maker, and has rights which can not, with impunity, be disregarded. Take away from man his personality, and the destruction of a human being would be no more serious a thing than the slaughter of a beast. It is the sanctity which is thrown around a person, as the reflection of the Divine glory, that makes it so awful a thing to be a man. He who can say, "Myself," is immeasurably nearer to God than any other form of being. He is not only from God, but like Him. Not only carries impressions of the Divine character, as the sun, the moon, and the stars, but carries in his bosom resemblances of the Divine attributes. We are not only His creatures, but His offspring, and, regulating our thoughts of Him by the analogies of our own nature, "we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." We should rise to the conception of His majesty, as of one that made the world, and all things therein—of one who, as Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands.

This statement of the conditions under which the notion of personality is realized, will correct the error into which the ignorant and unreflecting are apt to fall, of confounding it with figure, or material shape. We apply the term person so constantly to our bodies, that there is an imperceptible tendency to make the possession of a body essen-

tial to personal existence. But a little consideration will convince us that our bodies belong to us, but are not ourselves. We use them, and act through them, and by means of them. They are organs and instruments, but have not a single characteristic of personality. It is not the eye that sees, but the man that sees by means of the eye; it is not the ear that hears, but the man that hears through the instrumentality of the ear; it is not the leg or the foot that walks, but the man that walks by their help. These organs may be destroyed, and yet the power of vision, of hearing, of motion, remain in full integrity. They can not be exercised, for the want of the proper appliances, but they are there, and, could similar organs be replaced, could be easily called into action. In affirming, therefore, a personal, we are not affirming a material, God, bounded by any outline of figure or shape, or circumscribed to any space. We affirm a spirit—who is essentially self-conscious—whose essence is knowledge, holiness, power, and life—a spirit infinite, eternal, unchangeable in His being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. We affirm the existence of that great Being who sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in. That great Being, who, dwelling in glory and light inaccessible—the King eternal, immortal, invisible—permits us to behold the skirts of His robe in the analogies of finite personalities. We can catch a glimpse of Him, but we can not see Him, and the overpowering force of that glimpse causes us to fall back in ourselves, exhausted and wearied under the mighty idea of God. He alone is great—He only doeth wondrous things.

II. The difference is immense between the admission and rejection of such a being in every department of thought and of action. Speculation, equally with practice, changes its character according to the nature of the Divinity that terminates its inquiries. Upon the hypothesis of Pan-

theism, or any hypothesis which construes God into a logical, physical, or metaphysical necessity, the relation of the finite to the infinite can only proceed, as a great living writer has observed, upon the supposition of the immanent, or, more correctly speaking, of substantial identity. Given this pervading essence, this principle of being, and all things can be deduced from God with as rigorous certainty as the propositions of geometry from the definitions of the science. He being what He is, they must be what they are. He is necessary cause—they, necessary effect; He, necessary substance—they, its necessary affections. It is obvious that, upon this theory, all science must be *a priori* and deductive, and Spinoza was consulting the exigencies of his system full as much as the spirit of the age, in reducing his philosophy to the forms of mathematical demonstration. The case is very different upon the supposition of a personal God. There, the universe is the product of will. It is an effect which might or might not have been; its nature and constitution are alike contingent; all depends upon the choice, the purpose, the plans of the Creator. Philosophy becomes an inquiry into the designs of God, and these designs, as in every other case, must be determined by the appearances submitted to the scrutiny of experience. We have no data to determine beforehand what kind of a thing the world should be—what kinds of creatures it should contain—by what kind of physical laws it should be governed. We could not construct it from any principles upon which the understanding might seize. The simple circumstance that it and all its phenomena are contingent, puts it beyond the reach of philosophical anticipation, and establishes at once the method of induction as the only method of inquiry. Speculation, upon this hypothesis, is the reduction to unity of the facts of observation—the elimination of the laws which create and preserve the order which the will of God has established. Though the universe is a contingent effect,

it is not the offspring of caprice or arbitrary power. In ascribing it to a personal God, we ascribe it to a Being who is possessed of wisdom and knowledge, and whose will is always determined by the infinite perfections of His character. We may expect, therefore, to find a plan which is worthy of this august and glorious Being, and we can pronounce, with confidence, beforehand, that whatever is essentially contradictory to wisdom, goodness, and truth, can not enter into the scheme. But, when the question arises as to the concrete realities that shall positively be called into being, man can know, either in the world of matter or of mind, only what he has observed. In a personal being, you introduce the operation of a free cause—power becomes will, and the only necessity which is conceivable is that of acting from design. The whole problem of philosophy becomes changed—the absolute is resolved into a metaphysical absurdity—and a principle of existence apart from the omnipotent will of a creator, is a mere delusion. Hence the Scriptures recognize God in every thing. It is His almighty arm that sustains the fabric of the universe. He projected and keeps in their orbits those planets, suns, and adamantine spheres, wheeling unshaken through the void immense. It is His to create the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and to loose the bands of Orion. All things live, and move, and have their being, in Him. But not in Him, as part and parcel of His own existence—not as the properties or developements of His nature—but as the products of His will, which are absolutely nothing without that will. God's purpose: this is the only principle of being which the Bible recognizes. The counsel of His will: this is the goal of philosophy—the last point which science is capable of reaching. All our inquiries end at last in the confession: "Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in Thy sight. For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever! Amen."

We regret that we have not time to enter more at length into this discussion, and to show how the deductive and inductive methods of philosophy are essentially dependent upon the admission or rejection of the personality of God. Many who are enamoured with what appears to them to be a very profound and earnest philosophy of life, are not aware that the very spirit in which that philosophy is born is at war with the first principles of Theism. They do not see that any theory which involves a necessary principle of the world, excludes contingency, and, consequently, the operation of all will. It is clear, too, that this principle, if it exists, must be sought in consciousness. As thought, upon the hypothesis in question, must be the reflection of existence, and as we ourselves are a species of microcosm, we must look into the depths of our own souls for those great, controlling elements which determine the existence of every thing around us. We shall surely be able to find those fundamental and unquestionable data, stored away in the recesses of our minds, which shall contain the absolute explanation of every thing—those laws or primitive cognitions which belong to, and constitute, the Eternal Reason. We shall be able, in other words, to find the only God that can exist in ourselves. What Madame De Staël said of Fichte, that he announced the purpose of a future lecture in these atrocious words—"We shall proceed to make God"—is perfectly in keeping with the whole genius and temper of a speculation that expects to find any other nexus but that of a personal will between the finite and the infinite.

The question of a personal God might well be suspended upon the results, in science, to which its method of investigation has led. Bacon expounded the law, and since Bacon, what has not been accomplished? There is not a conquest in the world, of matter or of mind, which has not been won by the spirit of the inductive philosophy. It has explored every nook and corner of nature; it has

trusted to nothing but its eyes and ears, and those eternal laws of thought which constitute the forms of knowledge. It has found order, law, a plan; it has discovered design, the operations of intelligence and will, and penetrated beyond nature, to nature's God, as the author and finisher of all. It has seen and known. What, on the other hand, has Pantheism done? Nothing, absolutely nothing, but transmute into its own jargon the laws which induction has established. The empirical, indeed, it despises; but, unfortunately, the empirical is all that exists; and in despising that, it destroys the possibility of any real science of things. To sum up all that we would say in a few words, experimental philosophy is grounded in the hypothesis of a personal God. The Jehovah of the Bible is presupposed in the method of induction. The method of pure speculation is grounded in the hypothesis of a necessary cause, or principle, and identity of substance is presupposed in its methods of inquiry. The nexus between the finite and the infinite, in the one case, is will, and will alone; in the other, it is that of immanence, or in-being. The universe, according to one, is the product of Divine power; according to the other, it is God Himself, coming into sensible manifestation—the chicken hatched from the egg. The problem of philosophy, in one case, is to discover the plan of God, as gathered from the actual operations of His hands; according to the other, the very notion of a plan or design becomes an insoluble contradiction. According to the one, man knows nothing, until he has learned from observation and experiment; according to the other, he carries the elements of omniscience in his bosom. This is a faithful picture of the spirit and genius of the two systems. Judge them by their fruits.

III. The two systems are equally in contrast in their influence upon the whole department of moral obligation. According to the scheme of Theism, the relations betwixt God and man are those of a ruler and a subject—all intelli-

gent beings are under authority and government. They are placed in subjection to a law, which they are bound to obey—but which they are at liberty to disregard—and their happiness or misery is dependent upon their obedience or disobedience. The simplest, perhaps the most primitive, notion which we are able to form of the Father of Spirits, is, as Butler suggests, that of "a master, or governor. The fact of our case, which we find by experience, is, that He actually exercises dominion, or government, over us, at present, by rewarding and punishing us for our actions, in as strict and proper a sense of these words, and even in the same sense, as children, servants, subjects are rewarded and punished by those who govern them." This is not so much, says the same great thinker, a deduction of reason as a matter of experience, that we are under His government in the same sense that we are under the government of civil magistrates. All this is obviously inconsistent with the theory of Pantheism. The ruler and the ruled must be distinct; and yet, upon the hypothesis in question, they are essentially the same, only under different manifestations, or in different stages of developement. A law is a measure of conduct prescribed by a superior will, and the notions which underlie it are those of rightful authority, on the one hand, and the possibility of obedience or disobedience, on the other. Both these notions are discarded by Pantheism; and, as it deprives us of will, so it leaves us no other law but that of the necessary evolution of phenomena. It demands, on the one hand, an inviolable necessity, and, on the other, a rigid continuity. Obligation is the correlative of law, and rewards and punishments are the expressions of merit and demerit. But justice is utterly annihilated—reward, as distinct from mere pleasure—punishment, as distinct from mere annoyance or pain, becomes unmeaning. All moral differences in actions are contradictory and absurd, where the effect is a necessary manifestation, or an inevitable developement. Sin, as moral

disorder or evil, can not be conceived; it becomes only one step in the stage of events—a contrast in individual life, or the history of the world, by which the balanced harmony of a complicated system is preserved. It is no more liable to blame than the bitterness of wormword, or the filth of oil; and he who, by patient continuance in well doing, seeks for glory, honor, and immortality, is no more entitled to praise, or to eternal life, than sugar for being sweet, or milk nutritious. These are only parts and parcels of the grand world-process. Good and evil occupy the same position as light and darkness, or any other contrasts in nature. Sin, as a transgression of the law, deserving death, is a pure fiction. The system, therefore, in obliterating moral distinctions, and reducing the differences of right and wrong to the category of necessary contrasts, not only makes war upon the government of God, but aims a decisive blow at the government of man. It is in deadly hostility to the principles which hold society together, and impart to States their authority. Strike out justice and moral law, and society becomes the mere aggregation of individuals, and not their union by solemn and sacred ties, upon the basis of mutual rights and duties, and man ceases to be any thing but a higher class of beasts. Every being works out its destiny by the same resistless process. These conclusions could be verified by a copious appeal to the best and purest philosophers who have speculated upon morals in the spirit of Pantheism. The accomplished Schleiermacher could make no more of sin than Fichte or Hegel. The deepest convictions of conscience, the most earnest utterances of the soul, the sense of guilt and demerit, the ineffaceable impression of justice, he was obliged to explain away, in obedience to a system which, in the extinction of a personal God, had removed the centre around which alone these sentiments could find place. They are, indeed, memorials of a personal God, which never can be totally destroyed. We feel that we

are under law, that we are responsible for our actions, that we are capable of praise or blame. We feel that there is a right and a wrong in human conduct, and no sophistry can eradicate, in some of its manifestations, the sense of justice. So clear is the connection between God and our moral nature, that we can never get quit of the notion of Him as a ruler until we have suppressed the voice of our consciences. It is here, more than any where else, that we recognize the personality of the Supreme Being. We feel His existence, because we feel the pressure of His law, and have ominous forebodings of reward or punishment. Apart from the existence of a personal God, it is impossible to construct a consistent scheme of moral philosophy. We must stumble at the very threshold in explaining the great central fact of obligation. Turn it and twist it as you may, it always leads you to a superior will as the immediate ground of duty. Virtue never becomes law until it is enforced by authority. That will, to be sure, is determined by the nature of the person, and the ultimate ground of moral distinctions must be traced to the essential holiness of God. He can not but will what is right, and it is precisely the relation of right to this perfect and holy will that creates the obligation of the creature. From God all moral distinctions proceed, and to God they naturally and necessarily lead. Their very essence is destroyed the very moment you lay your hand upon His throne.

Here, then, the contrast between Pantheism and Theism is fundamental. It goes to the springs and measures of human action. Society, the State, the Family, every sphere into which the moral element enters, becomes, in the speculations of the Pantheist, a very different thing from what our natural sentiments lead us to apprehend, and from what is possible to be realized in experience. Man, in all his interests and relations, is a very different being, according as you view him in one aspect or the other; a moral subject under the government of God, or the prop-

erty and affection—the mere *modus*—of an all-pervading substance.

It is vain, therefore, to treat those speculations which strike at the personality of God as the harmless excursions of curiosity. True, the instincts of nature, in the ordinary tenor of life, are stronger, upon the whole, than these disastrous conclusions, but still they are not without their mischief in the humblest sphere, and on great occasions, when great interests are at stake, in periods of agitation and revolution, they may prompt to the most atrocious crimes. The Reign of Terror could never have been distinguished by its enormities, if God and retribution had not first been banished from the minds of its guilty agents. It is no light thing to make a mock at sin. He who trifles with the eternal distinctions of right and wrong, not only foregoes the blessedness of the next world, but introduces disorder and confusion in this. He is an enemy to earth, as well as to heaven. The belief of a superintending Providence is the guardian of society—the security of the State—the safeguard of the family. Its influence pervades every interest, and sanctifies every office of man; it ennobles his actions; sweetens his affections; animates his hopes; gives courage in the hour of danger; serenity in time of trouble, and victory in death. If there be a God, it is a great thing to be a man; if there be none, and men should universally act on the belief that there were none, we had rather be any thing than a member of the human race. Hell and earth would differ only in topography.

IV. But there is another aspect in which the two systems remain to be contrasted, and the immense importance of a personal God, such as nature and the Scriptures reveal, to be evinced.

Upon the hypothesis of Pantheism, religion becomes a contradiction in terms. What Howe long ago asserted of the scheme of Spinoza, is equally applicable to every system which abolishes the "Thou" of our prayers—that "though

he and his followers would cheat the world with names, and with a specious show of piety, it is as directly levelled against all religion as any, the most avowed, Atheism; for, as to religion, it is all one whether we make nothing to be God, or every thing; whether we allow of no God to be worshipped, or leave none to worship Him." But, apart from this consideration, which, of itself, is conclusive—apart from the circumstance that religion necessarily implies moral government, and is founded on the relations of a moral and intelligent agent to a supreme law-giver—piety is subverted by having no object upon which to fasten its regards. It consists essentially in affections, in fear, reverence, veneration, and love, which presuppose the existence of a person upon whom they can terminate. Its highest form is that of fellowship with God. It holds communion, a real, living intercourse, with the Father of our spirits. We speak to Him in the language of prayer, penitence, faith, thanksgiving, and praise; He speaks to us by those sensible communications of His grace, which make us feel at once that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. This free circulation of the affections and interchange of offices of love, is the very essence of spiritual religion. But when you remove a personal God, you destroy the only condition on which this state of things is possible. There is no being to love, no being to adore, no being either to swear by, or pray to; and all that remains of piety is a collection of blind impulses and cravings, which must create their object, and which in their developement, according to the law of suggestion, are, singularly enough, termed a life. The disciples of this school employ the language of genuine devotion, and seem to be intent upon a more full, vigorous, and earnest piety, than that which is fostered by symbols and creeds. Their hostility to the latter is pretended to be grounded upon an intense zeal for the Spirit. But when we come to look beneath these phrases, and inquire into

the life which is so warmly commended, we find nothing but the yearnings of humanity—a pervading sense of emptiness and want—without reference to their moral character and tendencies, exalted into architects of God. It is the study of these wants, and the fabrication of a being, or a principle, or any thing that seems suggested by them, that constitutes the whole life of godliness. It is like leaving a hungry man, from the mere impulse of appetite, in the first place to conceive, and then to create, bread; or a thirsty man, from the mere craving of his thirst, to image, and then produce, water. A craving enables us to recognize the suitable object, when presented, but never to frame either the conception of it, or the reality, beforehand. If a man had never seen, or tasted, or heard of food, he might have starved to death without knowing what he wanted. The feebleness and dependence of the creature may prompt it to admit the self-sufficient and Almighty God, when once He is revealed. But without being made known upon other grounds, the sense of dependence, however intense and penetrating, could never have carried us farther than a *something* on which we were dependent.

But in religion it is universally true that all our longings are the results, and not the antecedents, of knowledge. It is what the mind knows that inspires its aspirations and affections. Religious instincts are the offspring of reason and truth, and not the blind feeling of nature. When we know God, and sin, and ourselves; when we understand the law, and our destiny, then comes a sense of guilt, a longing for pardon, a desire of holiness, and peace. It is light let into the soul—truth pointed by the Holy Spirit—that awakens every truly religious emotion. We feel because we believe; we do not believe because we feel. The eye affects the heart; it is not the heart that produces the eye.

Men in their unconverted state are compelled, from the dictates of conscience and the voice of reason, to recog-

nize a personal God; but only in those relations in which the guilty stand to a judge—they believe, and tremble. Hence their anxiety to suppress the conviction. They would gladly embrace some principle of beauty, or feminine pity, which would bless their persons, without paying attention to their crimes. They would gladly fall back upon some impersonal spirit of nature, smiling in the stars, or whispering in the breeze, about which they could indulge in soft and romantic sentiments, without being put upon the troublesome duties of penitence, faith, humiliation, and self-denial. They, therefore, can spare a personal God, because they have nothing to hope, and much to dread, from Him. But the truly Christian man is robbed of every thing, if you take away his Lord and Master. He has, indeed, lost a friend, and such a friend as no substitute can replace. When he is unable to cry, "Abba, Father," his spirit is burdened with intolerable anguish. The very life of his soul is extinguished.

The privilege of communion with God is the reward signalized in no system but that of the Gospel. The completeness of the notion is there developed, and the manner in which it may be realized in individual experience, definitely described. It reconciles man to God, and God to man, and institutes a fellowship which, though it may be occasionally disturbed, can never be broken off. The love which it enjoins and engenders, is the union of the soul with the Author of its being—not the absurd imagination of the mystic, of being absorbed and swallowed up in God—as a drop in the ocean. "There is nothing, therefore," says an able writer, "we should be more anxious to protect from every presumptuous attempt to disturb the holy boundary between God and the creature, than just the opinion of the imperishable nature of love which binds both together. Instead of the self-hood of the personal creature being destroyed in the perfection of its love to God, it is much rather thereby elevated to its

full truth, and revealed in its eternal significance, as the subject and object of a love between God and the creature. Then does man first of all come into the true possession of himself, when he gives himself to God; whoever loses his life, shall find it. What true love to God desires is, not at all abstract identity, not a resolution into the Divine Being, but perfect and undisturbed fellowship with God, just as is promised in the Scripture, as its highest end—not that it shall *become* God, but shall see God face to face." The result of any hypothesis which confounds them, it may be added, is the simple destruction of one, or of both. In this aspect, therefore, Pantheism is most fatal in its results; it contradicts every principle of our religious nature, and, in leaving us without God, leaves us without hope in the world. It lays an interdict upon all the piety of the heart, and cheats us with the delusive sentiments of a vain fancy. It gives us poetry for God.

V. The personality of God has, also, a decisive influence upon the question in relation to the credibility of revelation, in itself, and in its miraculous credentials, which is now so keenly agitated among Neologists and the orthodox. The rigid continuity of nature is assumed, because nature is only a blind manifestation of properties and attributes which belong to a necessary substance. But the very moment you postulate intelligence and will, and ascribe the constitution of the universe to a free cause, its order is altogether contingent, and whether it shall ever be disturbed or not, depends entirely upon the plans and purposes of that wisdom which presides over all. Temporary and occasional changes may contribute to the ultimate end to be achieved. Occasions may arise, from the operations of subordinate intelligences, which will render extraordinary interpositions the most effective instruments of good. Miracles certainly become possible, since He who made nature can control it; and they become credible, if circumstances should ever be such as to render them important.

As to revelation, it is antecedently credible, upon the supposition that God is a person, that He should hold intercourse with His intelligent creatures. Persons naturally seek union; society is the sphere in which this mysterious reality becomes fully and completely developed. All finite persons would be miserable if there were none to converse with, and every principle of morality, truth, justice, and benevolence, supposes the existence of a social economy. So intimate is the connection between society and personality, that, in our humble judgment, the infinite God could neither be holy nor blessed unless there was a foundation for society in the very essence of Deity. A God that was only a single person, would want that union without which the person would be imperfect. Solitude may be enjoyed for a while, but it is imprisonment and death if made permanent. Hence, there is a deep philosophy in the doctrine of the Trinity. The Triune God is an all-sufficient God—all-sufficient to Himself, and all-sufficient to His creatures. Before time began, or the stars were born, the Father rejoiced in the Son, and the Son rejoiced in the Father. There was the deepest union, and the most ineffable communion, and it was only to reflect their blessedness and glory that other persons, and other societies, were formed, whose laws and principles must be traced to the very bosom of the Deity.

God being a person, therefore, it is antecedently likely that He would condescend to hold communion with His creatures; and hence all nations, whether barbarous or civilized, have assumed it as an indisputable truth, that the Deity converses with man. Go where you will, there are altars, oracles, and priests. This general consent in the credibility of revelation, is the testimony of the race to an original feeling of the soul; a premonition, on the part of God, of what may be expected at His hands. The voice of nature is never a lie; and hence, given a personal God, we may confidently conclude that He will not be without

messages to those who are capable of intercourse with Him. He will delight in condescending to talk with His subjects. The instinct of personality for union will prompt it, benevolence will prompt it, goodness will prompt it, and wisdom will direct and regulate all. With humility and reverence be it spoken, but there may be a something in the bosom of the infinite God, arising from His personal relations to us, analogous to those feelings of tenderness and solicitude which a parent cherishes, and which impels him to pour forth on his children our words of parting counsel.

ARTICLE VI.

THE SCOTCH-IRISH, AND THEIR FIRST SETTLEMENTS ON THE TYGER RIVER AND OTHER NEIGHBORING PRECINCTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA.*

There is nothing more common to thoughtful and civilized man, than the disposition to inquire into the past, and to trace the race from which we sprang to its earliest beginnings. But whoever attempts it, whether he be plebeian or king, will find his ancestry lost in some barbarian tribe, springing from others as savage as itself, which fill that pre-historic period between Japheth, the son of Noah, and modern times. Even the chosen seed, whose line can be traced the farthest back, ends in a race of idolaters. And, proud as we justly are of our immediate ancestors,

* This article was delivered at Nazareth Church, Spartanburg District, S. C., on the 14th of September last, as a Centennial Discourse, in commemoration of the early settlement of the Scotch-Irish on the Tyger River. It was not intended as a complete history of the Churches of the Up-Country, being confined to one portion of it, and not including events subsequent to the Revolution.

whether we be Saxon, Gaul, or Gael, we shall find ourselves to have sprung from pagan huntsmen, herdsmen, or fierce warriors, who remained such till they were tamed and softened by the true religion, and humanized by the culture of letters.

The migration of the Scots, it is believed, was through north-eastern Europe, by Belgium and the North of France, to Ireland. There they certainly lived in the third century, and there they first received the light of Christianity. In the sixth century, a colony of these Irish Scots* migrated to North Britain, and, settling in the County of Argyle, established there a kingdom, subjugated the Pictish tribes that were before them, and the ancient Caledonia was thenceforward the land of the Scots, and SCOT-LAND it remains till now. Thither went from Ireland, in the same century, Columba, surnamed Saint, and established what has been called his convent, on the island of Iona, but which was much more a school, under something like presbyterial supervision, for training ministers and missionaries of the Cross. Such were the ancient Culdees of Scotland, "worshippers of God," who held the pure doctrines of God's Word, and the Presbyterian government, a thousand years before Calvin was born, when the rest of the world were "wondering after the beast."†

Their light glimmered on amid the darkness which oppressed the nations, nor wholly ceased till Wickliffe, the

---

* The *Scoti Ierni.* See Claudian, a Latin poet of the fourth century, xxii., 251; and Buchanan, Hist., p. 34.

† Their opposition to Rome may be judged of by the following extract from the poems of Talliessin, who is supposed to have lived about A. D. 620:

"Wo be to that priest yborn,
That will not cleanly weed his corn,
And preach his charge among:
Wo be to that sheperd, I say,
That will not watch his fold alway,
As to his office doth belong:
Wo be to him that doth not keepe
From *Romish* wolves his erring sheepe,
With staff and weapon strong."

Usher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, p. 83, where the original Gaelic may be seen. See, also, Mason's Primitive Christianity in Ireland, p. 43.

morning star of the Reformation, arose. Their missionary labors were widely extended; their schools scattered over many countries of Europe, and attended by almost fabulous numbers. Let it be, even, that they were of a Scythian stock, as some have held, proverbial among the Greeks for the extreme of barbarism, they were now a Christian and intelligent people, and that unquenchable fire of soul, and courageous endurance, which had carried them forward over such tracts of country, to the farthest shores and islands of Europe, lived and burned brilliantly within them.

But the chilling influence of superstition at length invaded even them. The priest became lord of their conscience, and that mysterious darkness which arose from Rome, as its centre, spread like the morning mists over the hill-sides and crags of Scotland, and settled gloomily and heavily upon its lochs, and glens, and romantic valleys, over highland and lowland alike.

At length the day of Scotland's deliverance came. The voice of Luther awoke new echoes on those shores. Patrick Hamilton, a youth of royal lineage, of attractive and polished manners, and cultivated mind, a friend of Luther and Melancthon, whom he had visited at Wittemberg, was burned at the stake—Scotland's first martyr—exclaiming, "How long, O Lord, shall darkness cover this realm? How long wilt Thou suffer this tyranny of man?" A "shrewd and canny Scot" advised the Archbishop, when he burned any more, to burn them in cellars, "for the smoke," said he, "of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected as many as it blew upon." Other martyrdoms, however, followed. Helen Starke, after witnessing the execution of her husband, was strangled in a pool of water. George Wishart, a man of noble birth, before whom crowded audiences wept, glowed, and trembled, as he preached, was burned at the stake. John Knox would have accompanied him in his hour of danger, but Wishart forbade him. "Go back to your pupils; one is sufficient for one sacrifice."

This same Knox became the man of his age in Scotland; her great Reformer. He was the man, valiant for truth, of whom the Regent Morton, himself of the dauntless race of Douglas, as he looked thoughtfully into his grave, said, "There lies he who never feared the face of man." Noble prototype was he of his fearless countrymen, at whose return to Scotland from his exile, consternation seized the enemies of the Reformation. "John Knox! John Knox is come! he slept last night at Edinburgh!" was the frantic cry which announced the ruin of their plans.

On the third of December, 1557, the first covenant, in this land of covenants, was signed. In 1560 the first General Assembly was held. Out of a weekly exercise, or prophesying, conducted by the ministers, exhorters, and educated men of the vicinity, met for expounding the Scriptures, grew the classical Presbytery. To this was added the provincial Synod, and the whole order of the Presbyterian Church stood at length revealed.

James I. was the first Presbyterian king of Scotland, and right lustily did he promise, till he became sovereign of England, when his cry at once was: "No bishop, no king!" We are indebted to this inconsistent, corrupt, and pedantic monarch for two measures of incalculable good. One was, the setting on foot the English version of the Scriptures, from him called King James' version, which, however, had been suggested both by the Scotch Assembly and by the English Puritans. The other is, the project, attempted in 1559 and 1572, by Queen Elizabeth, in the counties of Down and Antrim, of colonizing the northern provinces of Ireland with a Protestant people. Reasons of State determined him to discountenance the Roman Catholic religion, especially in Ireland. Several of the Northern nobles resented his determination, and conspired against his government. Their lands were confiscated, and reverted to the crown. These territories James, with great wisdom,

arranged to plant with English and Scottish colonies; and he resolved to replace its scattered, miserable, and turbulent population with the adherents of a purer faith. The country was exceedingly desolate, and covered with innumerable woods and marshes. Its towns and villages had been levelled with the ground—its herds and products swept away by the war. Little remained except the isolated castles of the English, and the miserable huts of the natives, suffering under the evils of pestilence and famine. The escheated lands were disposed of to English, Scottish, and Irish undertakers of the crown, who agreed to colonize them. From the proximity of the country to Scotland, the Scotch settlers greatly predominated. They were a hardier people, stood the climate better, had fewer inducements at home, and were more favored by the king. Londonderry, Coleraine, and Belfast, were planted by the English, chiefly, but the counties of Down and Antrim were settled by the Montgomeries and Hamiltons of Scotland, who brought over many Scotch gentlemen and farmers.

Thus, after the lapse of nearly a thousand years, the Scots, whom Ireland gave to Caledonia of old, came back again to occupy their ancestral homes, and the *Irish Scots*, as they were called in the sixth century, became the *Scotch-Irish* of the seventeenth.

There came, also, in the first third of the seventeenth century, several noble ministers from Scotland, and some from England, under whose labors religion was greatly revived, and conversions were multiplied. "Preaching and praying," says Livingston, "were pleasant in those days." "And it was sweet and easy for people to come thirty or forty miles to the solemn communions they had." Though Presbyterian in doctrine and discipline, they were, at first, nominally comprehended within the pale of the Established Church of England, enjoying its emoluments and dignities, under the generous and friendly toleration of Archbishop Usher.

This season of loving kindness did not always last. Under Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, came persecution, and the Scotch-Irish began to look to America for an asylum. The "black oath," so called from its direful consequences, was administered by Wentworth, Lord Lieutenant, for these services made Earl of Stafford, who imprisoned and heavily fined even women who refused to take it. He even conceived the idea of banishing all the Presbyterians from Ulster. Afterwards came the Irish rebellion, in which one hundred and fifty thousand Protestants perished, during which the famous seige of Derry occurred, whose defence is still read with all the interest of romance. It was then the Scotch sent over an army to Ireland, with Chaplains in every regiment. With the concurrence of the Colonels, these Chaplains appointed Church sessions in each regiment. In the four regiments stationed at Carrickfergus, the ministers found themselves in a condition to hold a Presbytery; which, accordingly, was held on the 10th of June, 1642, and was the first Presbytery regularly constituted in Ireland.

It was more than one hundred years after this before this upper country of South Carolina was settled. But the Scottish settlers in the North of Ireland were, meanwhile, extending their cords and strengthening their stakes in their Irish home, bringing back to the Erin of their remote ancestry that pure faith and form of Church polity, which these, a thousand years before, ere yet they were overlaid by Rome, gave to North Britain, and made it, even then, a land of learning and piety. Her ministers were still educated in Scotland. She sympathized with all of Scotland's sufferings, wrongs, and tears, though the hand of persecution did not press as heavily upon her. A bright example was set before the Scotch-Irish by the country out of which they had come. The measures set on foot by the Reformers for the settlement of schools, made the Scotch superior in intelligence to any other nation in Europe.

"If a Scotchman was taken into a warehouse as a porter, he soon became foreman," says the historian, Macaulay. "If he enlisted in the army, he soon became a sergeant." And, in spite of her barren soil, Scotland made astonishing progress in all the arts of civilization. The same was true of the Scotch-Irish on the green shores of Erin. If they could not establish their schools by law, they could by private effort. And the province of Ulster, which their fathers found a wilderness, they have covered with beauty.

The South of Ireland is profusely blessed in the gifts of nature, in a far richer soil, and a milder and more genial climate; the whole, indeed, is an emerald set in the flashing ocean. The North is rougher, colder, and less genial, and yet, as you enter the province of Ulster, you have left the region of filthy cabins, sturdy beggars, dilapidated villages, and wretched, neglected farms, and fields of sluggards, luxuriant with thorns and thistles; and you enter a territory of rich culture, of comfortable dwellings, and thriving towns. You have passed from a land of joyous, often, but yet careless idleness, where the pig, cow, and child, herd together in miserable hovels, into a province where the diligent husbandman, the enterprising merchant, the intelligent, plodding mechanic, are found, and the virtuous housewife, who "seeketh wool and flax, and worketh diligently with her hands," who "layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff," who "maketh fine linen, and selleth it, and delivereth girdles unto the merchant;" and "whose candle goeth not out by night." It is the land of your Presbyterian ancestors, inhabited by a race instinct with the sense of right, and hatred of oppression; of an instructed, and not superstitious, conscience; educated in a pure faith, versed in that vigorous theology which Augustine, Calvin, and Knox, professed; their understanding, and reason addressed by an educated ministry on the Sabbath day, and their household virtues stimulated and formed by the voice of praise and prayer at the

domestic hearth. Behold your ancestors! Behold their country, and their religion, which have made them what they are!

Their love of adventure, their crowded population, and the religious disabilities under which the Government sometimes placed them, led many to seek in the colonies of America a new home, where they might again take root.

The older parts of Carolina had, almost from the beginning, some few representatives from the North of Ireland. From the year 1735 they came in larger colonies, and settled in Williamsburg, below, spreading themselves constantly further, over Sumter, Darlington, Marion and Horry. Pennsylvania was, to them, also, a favorite resort. They first settled in Buck's County, north-east of Philadelphia, and then stretched westward, in Chester, Lancaster, and York, to the haunts of the wild Indian, with whom they came, at last, into terrible collision. Their ministers were nearly all of liberal education. Some had taken their degrees in Scotland, and some in Ireland. Among them were the Tennents, Blairs, Francis Allison, Beaty; and of American birth, educated in the Scotch-Irish schools and colleges, Drs. Stanhope Smith, Patrick Allison, and others; civilians also, Judges Breckenridge and McKean, Chief Justice Williamson the historian of North Carolina, and Dr. Ramsay the historian of our own State; distinguished Generals of the war of the Revolution too numerous to mention; Robert Fulton, who applied steam to the propelling of vessels; and many divines and civilians distinguished in the history of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

The emigration of Scotch-Irish into the Up-Country of North and South Carolina was from Pennsylvania, either by gradual migration of families through the mountain valleys of Virginia and southward, or by a direct removal; or from Ireland to the port of Charleston, and by wagon, pack-horse, or often on foot, to their settlements here.

The line of emigration from Pennsylvania was through Kittatinny valley, west of the Susquehanna, to the Potomac, and through the valley of the Shenandoah, southward. To how large an extent our population was introduced from this source, the names of Lancaster, York, and Chester, from counties of the same name in Pennsylvania, themselves show.

This was the earliest emigration into the upper portion of this State, and, as it preceded the present division of counties, which did not occur till the year 1798, and also the division into precincts, which dates back to the year 1769, we will designate the settlements by other and more ancient names. The earliest of them all was "The Waxhaws," called from the tribe of Indians who have given name to one of the tributaries of the Catawba. Another famous settlement was "The Long Canes," in a direction south-west from the other. The earliest date of the first of these settlements appears to have been the year 1745; the date of the latter is not exactly known. Two families, of Gowdy and Edwards, were found in it by Patrick Calhoun, and those who came with him, in the year 1756. Gowdy was an Irishman, and seems to have settled in the neighborhood of old Cambridge, about 1750. Both of these names, "The Waxhaws" and "Long Canes," were, in usage, of indefinite extent.

If we look across the State from the Waxhaw settlement, in a south-western direction, we find, to the right of a line drawn to Gowdy's, in Abbeville, the present districts of York, Union, and Spartanburg, the greater portion of Chester, the north-west part of Newberry, the whole of Laurens and Abbeville, and the newer districts of Greenville, Anderson, and Pickens. Of these districts, Lancaster will appear to have been the first settled; Chester, Spartanburg, and Laurens, to have been settled in 1749

or 1750; Newberry, to have been settled in 1752*—though Judge O'Neal dates the settlement of Adam Summer, in the Dutch Fork, in 1745—Union and Pendleton, in 1755; Abbeville, in 1756; York, in 1760, and Greenville, in 1766.

The first very distinct notice of settlers on Waxhaw was in May, 1751, when six or seven families came thither from the North. In the fall of the same year, a few more joined them, and a considerable number early in 1752, chiefly from Augusta County, Virginia, and the back part of Pennsylvania. The first grant of land to Robt. McElhenny dates in 1751, and the first sermon preached among them was in February, 1753, by John Brown, then a probationer.

On the western side of the Catawba, on the waters of Fishing Creek, settlements were made of Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania at nearly the same date—1748, 1749, 1750, and 1751—and the same minister, Mr. John Brown, preached the first sermon of which we have any record among this people, at Landsford, on the Catawba, a point intermediate between them and the settlement on the Waxhaw. The Church here established was called, to distinguish it from another higher up the stream, and which was formed a little later, Lower Fishing Creek, and, subsequently, after its pastor, Richardson's Church, and is now known, its location having been somewhat changed, as Cedar Shoals. The settlement extended itself higher up the stream, and gave rise to another Church, which bears the name Fishing Creek at this day.†

The settlement and Church in Union District was not quite so early. Its first planting was in the years 1754 and

---

* The date of the settlement on Duncan's Creek.

† Between the two there appears at one time to have been a middle Fishing Creek Church, which became afterwards absorbed in Richardson Church. Catholic Church, on Rocky Creek, to the right of our line, was settled in 1758;(?) organized in 1759 by Mr. Richardson; called and settled James Campbell as their pastor in 1772, and enjoyed his ministry for a year and a half, in connection with the neighboring Church of Purity.

1755, by Scotch-Irish emigrants from Pennsylvania, who had lived under the ministry of Rev. Mr. Cathcart. Several heads of families, among whom were the names of Brandon, Bogan, Jolly, Kennedy, McJunkin, Young, Cunningham, Savage, Hughs, Vance, Wilson, settled in these then uninhabited wilds. They first lived in tents, and then erected cabins. Several of these households were persons of true piety. They frequently met on the Lord's day for reading the Scriptures, prayer and religious conversation, looking wishfully for the time when they should be visited by ministers of their own faith. They subsequently erected a Church on Brown's Creek, about four miles from Unionville, on the Pinckneyville road. This house of worship was intended to be used by Presbyterians and Episcopalians in common, and hence was called "The Union Church." It seems to have been a place of some note, since the name was transferred to the county, and is now borne by the district, and the village which is the seat of justice.

Earlier than this, and parallel in point of time with the Fishing Creek, and almost with the Waxhaw, was the settlement of the Scotch-Irish on the confines of the present districts of Spartanburg and Union, upon the Fairforest, a tributary of the Tyger River. It dates its origin from the settlement of seven or eight families from Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, who migrated to this spot from the years 1751 to 1754, in which year they were visited by the Rev. Joseph Tate, their pastor in Donegal, Lancaster county, whence they had emigrated.

Outside of the limits of Union District, within the confines of Newberry, and yet connected with the waters of the Tyger and the Enoree, was an early Church, now, perhaps, almost forgotten, known as the Grassy Spring Church. Its original founders, also, emigrated from Pennsylvania, were Scotch-Irish by race, and of the Presbyterian faith, and settled on the Enoree, Indian Creek, and Tyger River,

which are near each other in this part of the State. This settlement was made from the years 1749 to 1758, and from these various localities they met together at the Grassy Spring Church to worship the God of their fathers.

Duncan's Creek, in Laurens, (waters of the Enoree,) was not far off. The settlement upon it was by Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania, chiefly, in the year 1758. They built a house of worship in 1763 or 1764. Little River Church, near the line between Laurens and Newberry, was organized in 1764. Bethel, in York, and Bethesda, are nearly of the same date. Bullock's Creek, in the south-west corner of the same district, 1769 or 1770, and a few other Churches in the Up-Country date previous to the Revolution.

Among these Churches stands the Nazareth Church, in whose bounds we are now assembled.* Eight, ten, or twelve families settled here, on the waters of Tyger River, near its source, between the years 1760 and 1765. The Word of God was precious to them, and, as early as 1766, they obtained supplies, who preached the Gospel among them, occasionally, at least, and, as an early but brief history of this Church† informs us, was soon after organized. The more exact date of this organization is ascertained ‡ to be the Spring of 1772. The names of the families honored as the founders of this community are Anderson, Miller, Barry, Moore, Collins, Thompson, Vernon, Pearson, Jamison, Dodd, Ray, Penny, McMahon, Nichol, Nesbitt, and Patton. These were the names of the settlers migrating, directly or indirectly, from Pennsylvania, where their first homes in America were.

---

* See Note, p. 472.

† MS. History of the Second Presbytery of South Carolina, prepared by a committee of the same, appointed in October, 1808, consisting of Rev. John B. Kennedy, Dr. Waddel, and Rev. Hugh Dickson. Minutes of Second Presbytery, October, 1808, pp. 123, 124; April, 1809, p. 134.

‡ By a cotemporary record in a Family Bible, still preserved.

Into this goodly country these men, in most instances, no doubt, accompanied with their wives and children, came to set up their tabernacle. It was, indeed, a goodly land, a "land of rivers of water," "of springs sent into the vallies which run among the hills," of forests goodly like Lebanon, or the oaks of Bashan, with their grassy carpet or their tangled vines; of wooded mountains, or rolling hills, or undulating plains, or prairies covered with a rich growth of cane. The margins of many streams almost equalled the cane-brakes of the South-West. These facts are established by the names which many of the streams in the Up-Country still bear, as Reedy River, Reedy Fork, Cane Creek, and Long Canes. The cane growth of the country was, we are told, the standard, to many, of the fertility of the soil, a growth twenty or thirty feet high denoting the highest fertility, and that no higher than a man's head, a more ordinary soil.* And the tradition is preserved that one of the tributaries of the Tyger River received its name from the scene of woodland beauty which burst upon the view of the first emigrants. George Story and James McIlwaine, if we have their names aright, had encamped on a commanding eminence; a beautiful valley stretched far in the distance, a grove of lofty trees concealed the meandering of a stream which fertilized the tract below. The rays of the declining sun shed their departing beams on the tree-tops that waved over the wide amphitheatre in the evening breeze. One of the two, McIlwaine, it is said, exclaimed: "What a *fair forest* this!" The name attached itself to the place, and then to the bold and lovely stream, which, rising in the mountains, sweeps on, dispensing fertility and refreshment to the central portions of this and the neighboring districts below.†

---

* Logan's History of Upper South Carolina, p. 11.

† See, for this tradition, "Major Joseph McJunkin, or Original Sketches of the Revolutionary History of South Carolina," *Watchman and Observer*, Sept. 21, 1849. These valuable papers are from the pen of Rev. Jas. H. Saye.

These forests were not unpeopled. The buffalo, deer, and other wild game, the panther,* the wild-cat, the wolf and bear, and other beasts of prey, filling the night with their dismal cries, roamed through them; the beaver, architect and engineer together, built his works across the cold streams, and birds of varied plumage sang through the day and night around them.

The occupation of the hunter, the herdsman, and the farmer, were sometimes distinct, but in many instances, or in most, united in the same person. A large trade in peltry was carried on in the early history of this colony, through the port of Charleston, and to obtain the hides and skins, valued in Europe, many a huntsman, beside the native Indian, coursed through these primeval forests. The occupation of the herdsman, too, was largely followed, and cow-pens, or ranches, for cattle and those who reared them, were established at different points. One of them has become historic as the scene of a decisive battle of the Revolution, in which some of your ancestors took part. The unerring rifle could in a short time supply the table with abundant food for several days, and to the hardy yeoman life in the woods was not without its charms and sources of improvement; developing that self-reliant, independent, and heroic character, which is rarely to be found in the din of cities. If they were not clothed in soft raiment, they wore the more serviceable vestments domestic industry provided—the deer-skin moccasin, and the products of the wheels and looms of their wives and daughters. If they lacked some of the far-fetched delicacies modern appetite craves, their tables were loaded with abundance, and with food which the city epicure now seeks for at a great price.

---

* Commonly called tiger in this State. The Tyger River is said to have derived its name from a battle which took place on its banks between a tiger and a bear, in which the tiger was victor. The old orthography is retained in the name of the river. The Indian name was Amoyeschee.—Mills' Statistics, p. 762.

The first settlers had the choice of lands in this part of the State, and it has been remarked that the Scotch-Irish from Pennsylvania, who had some experience of America, and were, also, first on the soil of these upper districts, were more favorably located than those who came afterwards, directly from the North of Ireland, through the port of Charleston. Whether it were so in this community, we know not. But in 1767 or 1768, other families came here direct from Ireland, receiving their head-right of one hundred acres, and supplied with the most indispensable implements of agriculture by the Colonial Government. These families bore the names of Caldwell, Coan, Snoddy, Peden, Alexander, Gaston, Norton, and others. The same was true elsewhere. The Irish element succeeded the first immigration of the Pennsylvania Irish.

These settlements must have been greatly dependent, at first, on themselves for religious worship. But they were encouraged and strengthened by visits of ministers from abroad. The Waxhaw people were visited in February, 1753, by Mr. John Brown, a probationer from Pennsylvania, and in 1754, by Rev. Mr. Rae, of Williamsburg Church, in the Low-Country, and by Mr. Tate, of the Synod of Philadelphia. In the same year the Rev. Daniel Thane, of New Jersey, sent out to the new settlements by the Synod of New York, preached either here, at Fishing Creek, or Fairforest, under a spreading oak. In 1755 they heard the Gospel from the lips of Messrs. Hogg, Hugh McAden, and others. Mr. McAden preached to that people in November of this year, and at Fishing Creek, and so did Messrs. Brown and Rae, whose names are distinctly mentioned in connection with this Church. Mr. McAden also preached at James Atterson's (Otterson's) on Tyger River, a few miles above Hamilton's Ford, and at James Love's, on Broad River.

At this time the Waxhaw and Fishing Creek congregations put themselves under the care of the Old Scotch

Presbytery of Charleston, with the view of obtaining ministers from Scotland. Robert Miller, from Scotland, who had been occupied in teaching, and had been licensed by the Presbytery of Charleston, was called and ordained as their minister in 1756. He was a lively and popular preacher, but in a little more than a twelvemonth was deposed for irregularity of conduct. The congregation were dependent on various supplies, till, in 1759, they settled as their pastor the Rev. Wm. Richardson, of Egremont, England, a graduate of the University of Glasgow, who came to America in 1750, and resided for a season with the celebrated Samuel Davies, in Virginia. He and the Rev. Mr. Martin had been sent out by a society in New England and one in Scotland, acting conjointly, as missionaries to the Cherokee upper towns in this State. The Cherokees took up arms against the whites, and Mr. Richardson became pastor of the Waxhaw Church, having been ordained to this end by the Presbytery of Charleston. This energetic and faithful minister, besides serving his own congregations, travelled far and wide over this new country, preaching, organizing Churches, and administering the ordinances of God's house.

But now came a season of dreadful trial to these devoted people. The Indian tribes, which almost surrounded them, became incensed against the whites, and rose in arms to destroy them. The inhabitants of Long Canes, in Abbeville, fled for refuge to the older and more settled parts of the country. A party, of whom Patrick Calhoun was one, who were removing their wives and children and more valuable effects to Augusta, were attacked by the Cherokees, on February 1st, 1760, and, according to cotemporary journals, some fifty persons—according to other accounts, twenty-two persons—mostly women and children, were slain, and fourteen carried into captivity. After the massacre, many children were found wandering in the woods. One man brought fourteen of these young fugi-

tives into Augusta, some of whom had been cut with tomahawks and left for dead. Others were found on the bloody field, scalped, but living still. Patrick Calhoun, who returned to the spot to bury the dead, found twenty dead bodies, inhumanly mangled. The Indians had set fire to the woods, and had rifled the carts and wagons, thirteen in number.* This sad news filled the whole province with consternation, and the miserable fugitives, who sought refuge at Waxhaw and in the Low-Country, dependent on the charities of friends, were living witnesses of these deeds of barbarity. The Cherokees crossed the Enoree in this vicinity, if not then, yet later, compelling your fathers to establish "forted" houses in different localities, to which they could resort for defence. The children of Mrs. Hampton, and Messrs. James Reid, John Miller, Orr and Anderson, fell victims to Indian violence. In the old congregation of Grassy Spring several were brutally murdered. A stockade fort was built for protection at the house of Mr. Otterson. Into this the Quakers, also, fled for refuge, but would not take up arms. While here the Presbyterians assembled, usually, every evening, to read and pray, and "chant their hymns of lofty cheer." But the incursions of the savages became so frequent that these people, too, evacuated their fort, and fled for shelter to different inte-

* This attack was made on February 1st, 1760, on a descent just before reaching Patterson's Bridge, as they had stopped to encamp for the night, while they were entangled by their wagons, and could make but little resistance. Some, by cutting loose the horses, and joining a portion of the company in the advance, were so fortunate as to escape, under cover of the night. Among the slain was the mother of the family, Mrs. Catherine Calhoun, and a curious stone, engraved by a native artist, marks the spot where she fell, among her children and neighbors. Two little girls, daughters of William Calhoun, brother of Patrick, were carried into captivity, the eldest of whom was, after some years, rescued; the other was never heard of.—MS. of M. E. Davis. The grandfather of Mr. Samuel Clark, now of Beech Island, and several members of his family, were killed in the attack. The wife and four children escaped.

rior parts. The same was true of the Union Church, on Brown's Creek. They, also, betook themselves to Otterson's Fort for an asylum; but on leaving it, nearly all the Presbyterians retired to Pennington's Fort, on the Enoree.

During this season of calamity numbers of the inhabitants fell victims of Indian barbarity; yet, amidst these melancholy scenes of skirmishing, wounds, and death, in the intervals of military duty, this little band of Presbyterians kept up still their worship, observing sacredly the holy Sabbath, for more than two years of dreadful anxiety and hardship. After the French war was brought to a close, by the peace of 1763, these fugitives again, for the most part, returned to their homes, not always to remain in safety. In the congregation of Long Canes, about the end of 1763, the Creek Indians broke in and killed fourteen persons in one house, on the Savannah River.

The settlements, however, continued to increase in strength, and their Church organizations to become more complete. To this the labors of Mr. Richardson greatly contributed. At Long Canes, for example, in 1764, in a few days, he baptized about sixty children, and from the time he left home till he returned to his own Church, a space of about four or five weeks, he baptized about two hundred and sixty. The Synod of Philadelphia and New York sent out various ministers to labor as missionaries in these distant settlements. In 1765 Rev. George Duffield, of the Presbytery of Carlisle, spent three or four weeks with the Long Cane people, whose bounds had now become so large as to compel them to hold worship in different places, which became the centres of new Church organizations. Mr. Duffield also visited other Churches, and this tour of his was rich in religious blessings to our people. It would detain you to tell you of all. Rev. Robert McMordie, of Donegal Presbytery, in 1766, Mr. McCreary, from Pennsylvania—who received a call from the Long Cane people, now separated into several allied Churches, which call was

signed by two hundred and forty-nine persons—Mr. Bay, of Maryland, father of the late Judge Bay, Mr. Thomas Lewis, of Rhode Island, and Mr. Daniel Fuller, a Congregationalist, of New England, in the years 1767 and 1768, all performed useful and acceptable missionary service among the Churches.

In the year 1771, Rev. Azel Roe and John Close, of New Jersey, followed in their footsteps. They ordained elders in the Long Canes settlement, now Abbeville District, and administered the Lord's Supper, our authorities say, for the first time in all that land. In 1771, Rev. Josiah Lewis, of New Castle Presbytery, administered the Lord's Supper in different Churches, and Mr. Lewis ordained the first elders in Fairforest Church. Mr. Halsey, Mr. Tate, and Joseph Alexander, also visited them, and in 1778, the Lord's Supper was administered to them for the first time, by the Rev. Messrs. Alexander and Simpson. We find, also, the name of Mr. Campbell, probably a member of Charleston Presbytery, and settled in North Carolina, and James Edmonds, of Charleston, mentioned as laboring among them. In this way, principally, the Churches of this Up-Country were supplied with the ordinances of God's house, before the Revolution.

Mr. Richardson's useful life was terminated suddenly, and in a melancholy way, in the year 1772, an event deeply regretted, and his name should be held in lasting remembrance. In the same year the Rev. John Harris, whose name first appears on the roll of the Presbytery of Lewestown in 1768, and who visited the Carolinas at the appointment of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1770, moved with his family from Maryland, settled on the waters of Little River, in Abbeville, and took charge of the Churches of Upper and Lower Long Cane, and of Bull Town, or Rocky River. Before 1774 he had removed his ecclesiastical relations, and had become a member of the

Presbytery of Orange.* The Rev. James Creswell, also, of the Presbytery of Orange, organized the Church of Little River in 1764, and continued its pastor till 1778, when he was removed by death. The Rev. Joseph Alexander, afterwards Dr. Alexander, a native of Pennsylvania and a graduate of Princeton College, removed from Mecklenburg county, N. C., and became pastor of Bullock's Creek, in York District, in 1776. The Rev. John Simpson, born of Scotch-Irish parents in New Jersey, a licentiate of New Brunswick Presbytery, came to Fishing Creek in the fall of 1773, and was ordained by the Presbytery of Orange as pastor of the Churches of Upper and Lower Fishing Creek, and, subsequently, of Bethesda, in York. These three ministers are all that we find regularly settled over the Churches of this region at the commencement of the Revolution, with the exception of Wm. Raynoldson, who came from Ireland in consequence of a call sent thither, who was intemperate and schismatic, and took the Tory side in the Revolutionary struggle. Mr. Hezekiah Balch had been pastor of Bethel Church, York, but, soon after the beginning of the war, removed to Tennessee, and Rev. Thomas B. Craighead was ordained over the Waxhaw Church in 1779, but retired from the country the next year, on the appearance of the British army in these parts.

During all this period these congregations were receiving an increase by direct immigration from Ireland. Before and after the Revolution, the reply to questions, "Where are you going?" addressed to movers on the road from Charles-

* Mr. Harris was graduated at Nassau Hall in 1753, and on the 12th of October, in the same year, was taken on trials by the Presbytery of New Castle. In 1756 he was ordained pastor of Indian River, near Lewes, Delaware, and resigned in 1769. In the spring of that year he was sent, by the Synod, to Virginia, North Carolina, and "those parts of South Carolina that are under our care." In 1771, the Synod ordered him to supply at Hitchcock's and Cartridge Creek, in Anson County, North Carolina, for three months. He joined Orange Presbytery in 1774, and was set off, with five others, in 1784, to form South Carolina Presbytery.—Webster, p. 670.

ton, would be, "to *Chaster*," or, "to *Long Canes*." Some, as the father of Dr. Waddel, who arrived in Charleston in 1776, passed through this province to the Up-Country of North Carolina.

Now came the war of the Revolution, with all its severe trials. Not the least of these sprung, in this upper country, from different views on the merits of the contest. Most of the Scotch-Irish took the side of the Colonies, the emigrants from Scotland direct were more inclined to the Royal cause. This division of opinion prevailed the most extensively in the region between the Broad and Saluda Rivers; in some places the Royalists outnumbering the Whigs. In the fall of 1775 the memorable tour of Rev. Wm. Tennent and Wm. Henry Drayton, sent out by the Committee of Safety in Charleston, and accompanied by Col. Richardson, Joseph Kershaw, and the Rev. Mr. Hart, of the Baptist Church, was made, for the purpose of strengthening the friends of resistance, confirming the wavering, and confuting the Royalists. They commenced their efforts among the Germans about Granby, with poor success. Mr. Tennent would preach, and afterwards address the people on public affairs. He crossed the Saluda at Beard's Falls, preached at Jackson's Creek, Fairfield; at Rocky Creek Meeting House, in Chester, (now Catholic Church,) at Fishing Creek—where he found in Rev. Mr. Simpson a congenial spirit—at the Rev. Mr. Alexander's, on Bullock's Creek; at Bersheeba Church, in the northwestern part of York; at another Church of Mr. Alexander's, on Thicketty Creek. He met the Tories, "the nabob Fletchall,"* the two Cunninghams, and Brown, afterwards

* His name is spelled *Fletcher* by Mr. Saye, but *Fletchall* in Mr. Tennent's Journal and elsewhere. He lived at McBeth's Mill, in Union District, was taken prisoner by Col. Thompson and his men in 1775, (being found hidden in a cave,) and was sent to Charleston by Col. Richardson, with one hundred and thirty-five others. After the fall of Charleston he held a commission under the Crown. His estate was confiscated in 1782.

lowers to torture the wounded and dying, was capable of all this.

We have read of the bravery of your men—of Major David Anderson, who fought at Ninety-Six, at the siege of Charleston, at Eutaw Springs, and at Augusta; of Captain Andrew Barry, who met the foe at Musgrove's Mill and the Cowpens; of Captain John Collins, who fought on many fields, both in Carolina and Georgia.

We have read of Col. Thomas, of Fairforest, who commanded the Spartan Regiment till the fall of Charleston, three of whose sons watered the tree of Liberty with their own blood, and whose sons-in-law held commissions in the war. Of Wm. Kennedy, Samuel McJunkin, Major Joseph McJunkin, Gen. Thos. Brandon, Capt. Wm. Savage, Col. Hughs, and Major Otterson, in old Brown's Creek Church, below, who, with one other man, captured thirty of Tarleton's cavalry on their retreat from Cowpens; and of Samuel Clowney, of Fairforest, who, with his negro man, captured four of the enemy.

We have read of the brave women of the Revolution—among them, of Mrs. Thomas, of Fairforest, and her ride of fifty miles, from Ninety-Six, where her husband was prisoner, to Cedar Springs, to warn her neighbors and children there of a threatened attack, and of the heroic defence of her house by Culbertson, her son-in-law, who fired on the large band of attacking Tories, while she, her daughters, and her son Willie, loaded; of Mrs. Dillard, and her arrival on a gallop, to warn the camp of Col. Clarke, at Green Spring on Lawson's Fork, after she had prepared supper for the Tory band, led by Ferguson and Dunlop; of Dicey Langston, who forded the Tyger River at the dead hour of night, the waters reaching to her neck, floundering on, in bewilderment at times, to warn the settlement, where her brother lived, of the "Bloody Scout;" of Ann Hamilton, who seized the Tory that was firing her father's house, by his collar, and hurled him down the

ton, would be, "to *Chaster*," or, "to *Long Canes*." Some, as the father of Dr. Waddel, who arrived in Charleston in 1776, passed through this province to the Up-Country of North Carolina.

Now came the war of the Revolution, with all its severe trials. Not the least of these sprung, in this upper country, from different views on the merits of the contest. Most of the Scotch-Irish took the side of the Colonies, the emigrants from Scotland direct were more inclined to the Royal cause. This division of opinion prevailed the most extensively in the region between the Broad and Saluda Rivers; in some places the Royalists outnumbering the Whigs. In the fall of 1775 the memorable tour of Rev. Wm. Tennent and Wm. Henry Drayton, sent out by the Committee of Safety in Charleston, and accompanied by Col. Richardson, Joseph Kershaw, and the Rev. Mr. Hart, of the Baptist Church, was made, for the purpose of strengthening the friends of resistance, confirming the wavering, and confuting the Royalists. They commenced their efforts among the Germans about Granby, with poor success. Mr. Tennent would preach, and afterwards address the people on public affairs. He crossed the Saluda at Beard's Falls, preached at Jackson's Creek, Fairfield; at Rocky Creek Meeting House, in Chester, (now Catholic Church,) at Fishing Creek—where he found in Rev. Mr. Simpson a congenial spirit—at the Rev. Mr. Alexander's, on Bullock's Creek; at Bersheeba Church, in the northwestern part of York; at another Church of Mr. Alexander's, on Thicketty Creek. He met the Tories, "the nabob Fletchall,"* the two Cunninghams, and Brown, afterwards

* His name is spelled *Fletcher* by Mr. Saye, but *Fletchall* in Mr. Tennent's Journal and elsewhere. He lived at McBeth's Mill, in Union District, was taken prisoner by Col. Thompson and his men in 1775, (being found hidden in a cave,) and was sent to Charleston by Col. Richardson, with one hundred and thirty-five others. After the fall of Charleston he held a commission under the Crown. His estate was confiscated in 1782.

a famous Tory officer, at the muster-ground at Mr. Ford's, on the Enoree. He stayed with James Williams, on Little River, who afterwards fell at King's Mountain, and at whose house he was hospitably entertained; he preached for Mr. Creswell, who ministered there and at Ninety-Six; preached on Long Cane, at Boonesborough;* at one of Mr. Harris' preaching sheds; and on all these occasions, after the religious service, he addressed the people on public affairs. In this instance he was succeeded by Rev. Mr. Harris and Mr. Salvador. He also preached at Bull Town, and talked afterwards for three hours on the great question of those times; spent the night at Patrick Calhoun's; visited Fort Charlotte; took a military survey of the whole; gave orders to build the platforms for fighting the cannon and small arms. In the intervals of his preaching, all along, he was obtaining signatures to the Association, and forming volunteer companies, like a man in dead earnest. He crossed the Savannah, passed down to Augusta, called at Capt. Hammond's on Snow Hill, found his house "forted," and one of the finest situations in the whole colony; found a large body of militia there ready to move with Wm. Henry Drayton upon the Tories; found every considerable house in Augusta fortified. The whole journal is a remarkable record of a most important mission, disclosing the eloquence, activity, and energy of one of our Scotch-Irish

* This was the site of Fort Boone, called, probably, in honor of Thomas Boone, Governor of the Province. It was built for defence against the Indians, and was resorted to afterward for protection from marauding parties, whether Indian or Tory. It was a palisade fort, with port-holes, and had within a school house, minister's house, and other log buildings. Much of the catechetical and other instructions of Mr. Harris were given in this and other *forts*. The father of Rev. Dr. Gray, now of LaGrange, Tennessee, and his aunt, a venerable lady, not long since deceased, attended as pupils and catechumens of Rev. John Harris, in Fort Boone. The preaching station was the origin of the Church of Hopewell, built afterwards about three miles distant, and known at different times as Fort Boone, Boonesborough, and Hopewell Church.—MS. of M. E. D.

Presbyterian ministers, son of the celebrated William Tennent, who lay in the trance and saw things which it was not lawful to utter.

We feel ourselves burdened with the multitude of traditions which crowd upon us, and which belong to this period. The Up-Country eventually became, to a large extent, the battle-ground of the war of the Revolution, and where the tide was turned in our favor. But the whole contest was one of cruel suffering. The most bloody foes your fathers had were neighbors reared with them, acquainted with all their ways, and more unforgiving than those who had crossed the ocean to fight us. Your soil was the camping-ground of friendly and hostile forces, resounding under the hoofs both of Washington's and Tarleton's dragoons, and wet with the blood of your kindred and their foes.

Through the diligence and labor of your pastor, we have been able to learn the story of "the Plundering Scout," who passed through these neighborhoods some eighty-four years ago, taking every thing that could be of value to them, horses, cattle, beds, and bedding; hanging one aged man in his own gate-way, and hacking another with their broad-swords. And of the "Bloody Scout," of which "Bloody Bill Cunningham" was the presiding genius, who came after, like Death on the pale horse, and Hell following; of their killing the sick man (Capt. Steadman) in his bed; of their hacking the boy, John Caldwell, in pieces; of their killing John and James Wood, and the last, notwithstanding his wife's entreaties; and of the death of John Snoddy at their bloody hands. If the cruel chieftain, William Cunningham, led this party, their acts are not to be wondered at. He that could shoot his neighbor, John Caldwell, in his own yard, in his wife's presence, could hew down, at Hay's Station, Daniel Williams and his brother Joseph, a lad of fourteen, both brothers of Col. Williams, who fell at the head of the South Carolina column at King's Mountain, and could encourage his fol-

low
all
V
Da
Ch
An
the
ma

ma
th
ow
wa
M
H
be
to
C
fo

a
o
p
c
f
c
c
a

lowers to torture the wounded and dying, was capable of all this.

We have read of the bravery of your men—of Major David Anderson, who fought at Ninety-Six, at the siege of Charleston, at Eutaw Springs, and at Augusta; of Captain Andrew Barry, who met the foe at Musgrove's Mill and the Cowpens; of Captain John Collins, who fought on many fields, both in Carolina and Georgia.

We have read of Col. Thomas, of Fairforest, who commanded the Spartan Regiment till the fall of Charleston, three of whose sons watered the tree of Liberty with their own blood, and whose sons-in-law held commissions in the war. Of Wm. Kennedy, Samuel McJunkin, Major Joseph McJunkin, Gen. Thos. Brandon, Capt. Wm. Savage, Col. Hughs, and Major Otterson, in old Brown's Creek Church, below, who, with one other man, captured thirty of Tarleton's cavalry on their retreat from Cowpens; and of Samuel Clowney, of Fairforest, who, with his negro man, captured four of the enemy.

We have read of the brave women of the Revolution—among them, of Mrs. Thomas, of Fairforest, and her ride of fifty miles, from Ninety-Six, where her husband was prisoner, to Cedar Springs, to warn her neighbors and children there of a threatened attack, and of the heroic defence of her house by Culbertson, her son-in-law, who fired on the large band of attacking Tories, while she, her daughters, and her son Willie, loaded; of Mrs. Dillard, and her arrival on a gallop, to warn the camp of Col. Clarke, at Green Spring on Lawson's Fork, after she had prepared supper for the Tory band, led by Ferguson and Dunlop; of Dicey Langston, who forded the Tyger River at the dead hour of night, the waters reaching to her neck, floundering on, in bewilderment at times, to warn the settlement, where her brother lived, of the "Bloody Scout;" of Ann Hamilton, who seized the Tory that was firing her father's house, by his collar, and hurled him down the

stairs. There were Scotch-Irish Elders in this upper country, such as Gen. Pickens, Major Otterson, Col. James Williams, who fell at King's Mountain, with three hundred and seventy-five Royalist enemies killed or wounded, and various others, that did their country good service in that conflict. There were Presbyterian Ministers of the Gospel who helped on the cause of freedom. The classic Alexander, from his pulpit in the "old Log Meeting-House," at Bullock's Creek, and some times here, also, would discourse with inspiring eloquence of his country's wrongs, while the stalwart men and brave lads, with rifle in hand, kept guard over him and the worshippers alike. There was John Simpson, at Fishing Creek, who stirred up his people to take up arms against the enemy, and set them the example. He shouldered his rifle, and was in the engagements at Beckhamville and Mobley's, and was with Sumter in 1780—was with him when surprised by Tarleton at the Catawba Ford, and narrowly escaped with his life. As a consequence of his zeal, his house was plundered and burnt; his study and library set on fire and consumed, save the few books Mrs. Simpson could carry forth in her apron. James Creswell and John Harris lent their aid, too, to the good cause. You might have seen the latter, now fleeing from his vindictive enemies and taking refuge in the thickets of the forest, now in his pulpit on the Sabbath, his gun in the desk beside him, his ammunition suspended from his neck, after the fashion of the day, the reverent worshippers bowing *upon their arms* as he fervently lead the public prayer, or, with upturned faces, listening to the words of truth and soberness, so much needed in that time of peril, which came from a sincere and feeling heart, though uttered with stammering lips. In another neighborhood, on Rocky Creek, (waters of the Catawba,) the eccentric William Martin, the only Covenanter Minister then in the Colony, with tremendous energy roused the people to defend their homes and

avenge the blood of their slaughtered friends, and the cruel injuries of the wounded men, whose mutilated forms might be seen in the old Church of Waxhaw, converted into a hospital after Buford's defeat, and filled with the groans of the wounded, instead of the songs of worshippers.

Such were your heroic ancestors. Around you are places memorable, if not as fields where great battles were fought with vast armies, yet for important engagements. Some times the fortunes of war were against us, as at the Waxhaws, Rocky Mount, and Fishing Creek; but for the most part, were in our favor, as at Green Spring, Musgrove's Mill, Cedar Spring, Hanging Rock, Beckhamville, Wateree Ford, King's Mountain, Rugely's Mills, Fishdam Ford, Blackstock's, and the Cowpens, a battle all-important to the establishment of our independence, which turned the tide of war away from these mountains and valleys, and was the first in those successive steps which rescued Carolina and the remaining Colonies from British oppression. Before us this day are the descendants of those brave men who had a hand in all these deeds of valor, and those heroic women who sustained them, and some times rescued them in the perilous conflict.

The Scotch-Irish, too, were well acquainted with the principles of constitutional liberty and representative government. The English Puritans had done their share—the Hampdens and Sydneys of the days of Cromwell; old John Knox and the signers of the Solemn League and Covenant—the brave old men that inscribed on their banner, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant"—those whose views, and faith, and discipline, were of the Genevan type; but the men of North Ireland, in this country, seem to have excelled them all in hatred of oppression and in the love of regulated liberty. The native Scotch and the Scotch-Irish have not always agreed. Scotch communities in these Colonies some times sided with the Crown, but the Scotch-Irish always with the friends of liberty. We have not

time to enter into the discussion now. But we claim that the views of the thoughtful men of this stock have been borne out in a very especial manner in the constitutions of our American governments.

Another thing we claim for this race of men—yet not for them alone—a high valuation of the blessings of education. This they have in common with the native Scotch. Indeed, we might allow, if any should claim it, the superiority of these. They certainly set the bright example, as the mother Church. It is one great feature of Protestantism, in opposition to Papacy. It is especially a feature of the Calvinistic faith, as developed and carried forth among our fathers. It is the education, not simply of the intellect, training it to feats of dialectics, storing it with ancient lore, or making it sensitive, like the Grecian mind, to outward beauty. It is the education, rather, of the whole man, aimed at the religious principle within as first, informing it with the knowledge which is not of the earth, earthy, but is of heavenly origin—seeking first to establish the kingdom of heaven within, and then adding, over and above, all these things of use and beauty, to make up the perfect man.

From our earliest history, therefore, the Church and the school-house have gone together. As soon as rude dwellings could be erected in the primeval forest, there was a rude Church to stand at some central point, and a rude school-house by its side, or elsewhere, where, with the catechism of the Westminster Divines, and God's Holy Word, the elements of an English and a classical education were obtained. To the more private school succeeded the academy, and then the college, above which the university, after the European model, is, in some few places, seeking to rise.

Of the ministers whom we have named, Dr. Joseph Alexander, of Bullock's Creek, was a noted teacher, resorted to by many young men who afterwards rose to distinction in

society. We have heard the late Gov. David Johnson speak of him as an accomplished scholar, and in terms of the highest praise. "He gave me all the education," said he, "I ever had." Another of these schools was taught by James Gilleland, Jr., on the Tyger River, in which Samuel B. Wilson, of the Union Seminary, was taught. Of Dr. Moses Waddel, Mr. Calhoun, who was his pupil, said: "He was the father of classical education in the Up-Country." McDuffie, Legaré, Petigru, Judge Butler, Wm. H. Crawford, and many other distinguished men, were among his pupils. Indeed, it is the testimony of old men, reared in this portion of the State, that education was altogether in the hands of our own people, and conducted chiefly by our Ministers.

Many of these schools obtained notoriety, and received incorporation. The Mount Zion College and Society was incorporated in 1777, during the war of the Revolution, and, under the able Presidency of Rev. Thos. Harris McCaule, conferred degrees, and was very flourishing. From 1786 to 1795, sixteen candidates for the ministry, from its walls—Wm. C. Davis being the first, and John Cousar the last—were licensed by the old Presbytery of South Carolina, under the care of the General Assembly. Nine years before this, in 1768, Rev. James Creswell and others were incorporated as the "Salem Society," to support a school and seminary of learning near Little River Meeting-House, in the district of Ninety-Six. The school taught by Rev. John Springer, at Old Cambridge, was chartered as a college. In 1778 the Catholic Society, in Sumter, was chartered for the same interest. In 1797 Rev. James Templeton, James Jordan, and others, were incorporated as "The Spartanburg Philanthropic Society," for the erection of an academy, and at the same time the Rev. Joseph Alexander, James Templeton, John Simpson, Francis Cummings, and others, received incorporation as "The Trustees of Alexan-

dria College," to be erected near Pinckneyville, where Dr. Alexander had long taught.

It is pleasant to see the same value put upon educational institutions by the generation and the congregation before us. The High Schools, male and female, which you have reared, and the pleasant Village of Reidville, which has grown up around them in these three years past, are evidences of this, and auguries of good to your children after you.

Thus have we detained you long with the history of your ancestors. They have been called pugnacious. This character belongs to the excitable Milesian, of Southern Ireland, but your ancestors were law-abiding, and when they fought, it was not in passion, nor self-will, but for a just and regulated liberty. They have been called head-strong and obstinate. But they had only that tenacity of purpose which even the Roman Horace praises—which succumbs not in adversity—which bears up under discouragements, and stops not till its noble purposes are accomplished. They have been called over-scrupulous, but they did not stand divided and hesitating, like the Scotch Presbyterians at the battle of Bothwell Brig, till their enemies overwhelmed them. One common soul possessed them in their hour of peril.

The faith which they professed—the religious element which underlies their character—gave them energy of purpose, as it has to all who have embraced it. That Calvinism which was the terror of kings and the friend of republics; which the dissolute Charles II. declared was not fit for a gentleman, because it lifted the lowly into greatness, making him a king and a priest unto God; which took the liberties of England into its keeping, and restrained absolute monarchy in France, Scotland, England, and Ireland; which claimed intelligence for the people, and planted the common school in every congregation; which gathered the children morning and night around the

hea
the
wh
age
rifl
nei
by
dre
wh
say
me

wh
by
wh
In
G
ve
of
m
Y
V
vi
re
b
a
y
i
r
a
y

hearth-stones, to listen to the Word of God, to chant the sacred psalm, and hearken to the voice of prayer; which inspired the maidens of those days with lofty courage; which made your patriot sires take down their trusty rifles and go forth, in God's name, believing that their neighbors, animated by the same motives, would be found by their side, as they fought for their wives and their children, and, above all, for the glorious heritage of freedom which their fathers had left them; this, we hesitate not to say, had far more to do with their energy of character than most are willing to allow.

Noble men! noble women! matrons and maidens both, who inhabited these wilds when the night air was broken by the howl of the wolf and the piteous cry of the panther! who gathered into your forted houses when the painted Indian or cruel Tory were prowling around! Ministers of God! Richardson, Alexander, Simpson, Creswell, Harris, venerable Elders over the Saviour's flock! leaders, too, oftimes, on the ensanguined field! Williams, who fell foremost on the gory sod! Pickens, hero in many a battle! Ye leaders of true-hearted men! Thomas, Anderson, Moore, Williamson, Collins, and ye men that were led by them to victory or death! we cherish your memories this day. We rehearse the story of your deeds and sufferings. We would be encouraged by your example to go forth on every holy and honorable path. We would gather strength from you—your principles, your religion, and your God—to press on in the contest in which we are even now engaged, that we may fight your battles over on a grander scale, and secure anew that inheritance of freedom and right transmitted by you to us, and which, but for this effort, is for ever lost!

ARTICLE VII.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.

It is a matter of great regret with us, that our remarks in the July number of this Review, upon the presence of the South-Western Delegates in the last General Assembly, should have proved offensive to any of those brethren. We can only plead the privilege of a free press to comment freely upon the official conduct of public men. It was our opinion that no Southern man ought to have attended the Assembly, inasmuch as our country was at that time at open war with the North. And we hold the same opinion still—but we do not, and did not, claim to judge for any one but ourselves. It seemed to us that the brethren who attended the Assembly put themselves into a false position, and would find their attendance misinterpreted on all hands; and so it certainly has proved. We designed no offence in expressing that opinion, but considered it incumbent on us, as a reviewer of the Assembly, to refer to the matter, as to the other points which were likely to be of interest to our readers.

To one of these Delegates, in particular, we would express our regrets for having given currency, in our review of the Assembly, to an unjust statement respecting him. We refer to what we put on record, on the authority of the Philadelphia *Presbyterian*, as to the Rev. Mr. McInnis, of New Orleans, having said that the Southern people, generally, did "not sympathize with the rebellion." We had reason to believe that the Rev. Dr. John Leyburn, of Virginia, was reporter, as usual, for his own paper, and we copied the statement, therefore, as probably correct, on *his* authority. But we added the expression of our hope that the *Presbyterian* was in error. What more could we do? Nevertheless, the statement, being denied by Mr. McInnis,

is, of course, not correct as concerns him; and, therefore, unsolicited by him, we take this opportunity of putting down upon our own pages this acknowledgment of the error, and this expression of our regrets for the injury done to him.

We are, also, free to say, with respect to the important and difficult question of the relation of the kingdom of Christ to the kingdoms of this world, upon which we expressed ourselves strongly in our review of the Assembly, that further reflection has modified essentially our views. It is, indeed, difficult to say, in every case, where, precisely, Church power ends, and the power of the State begins. Rebellion is *a sin*, and sin may be condemned, of course, by any Church court, because the Church may enforce all that the Word reveals. But how far the Church court is authorized to go in determining between a lawless rebellion and a just and righteous revolution, it is difficult to decide. When a new Government is set up, *de facto*, and Christian men have to judge whether they ought to obey it or to adhere to their old allegiance, we must acknowledge that the Word of God does not enable any Church court to give them light in their doubts and darkness. The Scriptures command servants to obey their masters, and children their parents, and subjects their rulers; but the servant always knows his master, and the child his parent, while the subject sometimes can not tell who is his lawful ruler. Here the moral question depends on a political one; and that political one is not determined in the Word, and, therefore, it is not the Church that can point out to the honest but doubting subject where his allegiance is due.

We confess our need of more light upon the whole subject. We are not able to say how far, in the very midst of revolution and war, individual Ministers of the Gospel may go in making use of their rights, or in assuming to discharge their duties of citizenship; nor can we decide how far the individual Pastor, in his pulpit, may go in manifesting his sympathy with the old Government or the new, as

the case may be, in the way of exhorting his flock to constancy, to patience, to obedience; or in the way of asking the Divine blessing on the cause of the one or the other side. And how far, then, may the Assembly of Pastors go in the same line of manifesting a sympathy with either the one Cæsar or the other, in the way of appointing a day of fasting and prayer for the Divine blessing; or in the way of joining, themselves, in the prayers of the Moderator, or of any other brother, for the favor of the Almighty to either army; or in any kind of recognition of the solemn and sorrowful condition of their divided and distressed country?

Acknowledging this state of embarrassment and doubtfulness of mind about the subject, of course we are bound to withdraw, and do hereby withdraw, all our expressions which reflected on the Southern Commissioners in the last Assembly, as not having done justice to the question or to their own country in the debate. It was a question very difficult indeed to deal with, in full justice. We have no doubt that they were patriotic and honest men, and that, having felt it their duty to go to the Assembly, they discharged their obligations there in the fear of God, and as faithfully and ably as any other like company of brethren could have done in the same circumstances.

It was very far from our design to wound the feelings of any one of those brethren, or to injure their reputation, in the Church or the State. With Scotch-Irish blood running in our veins, we have to speak, usually, with some warmth and earnestness; and occasionally we write, our friends have often told us, with a seeming abruptness. This, we suppose, can hardly be charged to our blood. Neither the warmth nor the abruptness, however, have any mixture of malice. We love our brethren. We desire, with all our heart, the peace of the Church. We salute them with the Apostle's salutation, of Grace, Mercy and Peace. May the blessed Master smile on us all, and use us all, in our new circumstances, for His own glory, and the comfort and prosperity of Zion!

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XIV.—NO. 4.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Fathers and Brethren of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary:

On entering formally upon the discharge of the duties of the office into which I have just been inducted, I beg leave to express the deep feeling of responsibility which oppresses me, and of self-distrust, which would have prevented my listening to the call to it, had I believed that I was free to decide in accordance with my own opinion of my fitness. But without obtruding upon you an account of the many reasons which would have induced me to refuse it, clustering more or less closely around the one already presented, permit me to say that I did not dare to yield to them, because the Synod of Georgia, in appointing me to this office, did not act so hastily that I might have regarded their appointment as the result of accident. And hence, although I can not shake off the anxious fear that they have been mistaken in the estimate which led them to make the choice, I may not do otherwise than obey, and

go forward in the path which has been set before me, trusting in the judgment of the Church Court which called me, rather than in my own; and above all, relying for wisdom and understanding upon the Infinite Source of light and knowledge.

The oppressive feeling of responsibility is greatly increased by the fact that I have been called, not to discharge the duties of an office already well known, in which the experience of many predecessors affords guidance, but to organize an entirely new department of instruction, without a single similar chair in any theological school, either in America or Europe, to serve as a model. There is, it is true, a chair of Natural Science in the New (Theological) College of the Free Church of Scotland, at Edinburgh; but it is so different in its design from that which you have established, that it forms no exception. "The peculiar business of its course consists in an illustration of the three following branches, into which natural science may be divided: I. Synthology; II. Biology; III. Geology." And it is regarded as merely "destined to embrace a practical course of natural theology."* The task assigned me is all the more difficult on account of the various and even conflicting views which prevail respecting its nature, and the brief and somewhat indefinite instructions given in the resolutions of the Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, by which the chair was established. For these reasons, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to present to you my own views as to what you have given me to do, and the mode and spirit in which it is to be done, in order that, if I have not mistaken your design, I may go forward the more confidently; and if I have misapprehended it, that I may have the benefit of your counsels and your instructions in changing, restricting, or extending my plans.

---

* Introductory Lecture: By John Fleming, D. D.

The need of some means of giving to our theological students a more thorough acquaintance with natural science, as far as it has any real or imaginary connexion with revelation, has long been felt; for it has been evident, especially during the last fifty years, that disbelief in the word of God has been relying for its support and its justification, before the reasoning world, more and more upon the several branches of natural science. The arguments brought forward in defence of the truth, have often been characterized by such ignorance of the actual nature and force of the objections urged against it, that they have, not unfrequently, been injurious to the cause defended, and promotive of the scepticism attacked. This has always been the case to a painful extent, as well as at present, when perverted science furnishes infidelity with so large a proportion of its weapons. The most excellent works of many divines, in every age and every branch of the Church, have too often been marred by ineptitudes and fanciful absurdities, whenever they have touched the material works of God. But it has only comparatively recently become important that the connexion between the works and the word of God should be made the subject of special study in a theological course. It has become so now, by the increased number of points of supposed contact, and the wide prevalence of the opinion, in almost every community, and among all classes of people, that the relation subsisting is that of antagonism. Our ministers have by no means been behind the age in this field of knowledge, as has often been tauntingly said; but they have not all been sufficiently in advance of it. Here, as in every thing else which will fit them to understand fully the Word which they preach, to refute the sophisms of unbelievers, and to remove the doubts of those whose faith has been shaken, they should be, if possible, far beyond those whom they would teach.

It has been perceived, by all who can appreciate the amount of study and investigation involved, that the discussion of these topics embraces too wide a range to suffer it to be attached, without great detriment, to existing departments of instruction. It has been wisely thought that it would be better to leave it untouched, than to place it where it could not receive proper attention from either instructor or instructed; for it has been chiefly imperfect, one-sided views that have given rise to the wide-spread belief that there is antagonism. It would only have aggravated the evil to have intrusted the new department to any one who was already fully occupied, as each professor should be, with the appropriate duties of his own chair.

The first step in our Church Courts, looking to the supply of the want so generally felt, which led to any definite result, was taken by the Presbytery of Tombeckbee, in the autumn of 1857; when the following preamble and resolutions, introduced and warmly supported by the Rev. Dr. James A. Lyon, of Columbus, Mississippi—to whom this chair owes so much, from its inception to its final establishment—and as warmly supported by the Rev. Richard S. Gladney, of Aberdeen, were unanimously adopted, viz.:

"*Whereas*, We live in an age in which the most insidious attacks are made upon revealed religion through the natural sciences; and as it behooves the Church, at all times, to have men capable of defending the faith once delivered to the saints, therefore,

"*Resolved*, That this Presbytery recommend the endowment of a professorship of the natural sciences as connected with revealed religion, in one or more of our theological seminaries, and would cheerfully recommend our churches to contribute their full proportion of funds for said endowment.

"*Resolved*, That the same be brought before our Synod (of Mississippi) at its next meeting for consideration."*

The Synod of Mississippi subsequently, at its meeting in 1858, unanimously approved this proceeding of the Presbytery, and "cordially recommended the same to the consideration of the next General Assembly."

In the mean time, the attention of the Hon. Judge John Perkins, of "The Oaks," near Columbus, Mississippi, was directed to the subject, by frequent conversations with his friend and pastor, the Rev. Dr. Lyon. Already fully convinced of its importance, his purpose to coöperate must have been strengthened by the illustration before him, in the neighboring city of Columbus, of the use made of the natural sciences by sceptics, and of the great value of a studied acquaintance with these sciences, and their true relations to revealed religion, as evinced in the triumph of his pastor over all unbelieving assaults. Judge Perkins had previously determined to consecrate a princely sum to the purposes of theological education; and now his resolution was taken to devote a portion of it to the establishment of the proposed professorship. He munificently offered, first, the sum of thirty thousand dollars for its endowment in the Theological Seminary at Columbia; and subsequently, supplemented this amount with ten thousand dollars more, that the chair might be amply and generously sustained. The Board of Directors most gladly accepted the princely offer; and, on the 15th of January, 1859, the arrangements respecting the donation were consummated; the Seminary having been aided here, too, by the invaluable services of the same sterling friend to whom it had been so deeply indebted at every other step.

The written instrument of gift, of the above date, conveying the sum of fifty thousand dollars to the Seminary, of which twenty thousand dollars was for other purposes,

* Southern Presbyterian Review, Vol. XII., p. 182.

"*Witnesseth*, That whereas the said John Perkins is anxious and desirous of making an investment of funds during his life, which will be a permanent source of good to his fellow-creatures after his death: and whereas he is fully satisfied that the greatest good in his power to bestow upon his fellow-men may be effected by and through the Board of Directors above mentioned, in the manner, way, and under the restrictions hereinafter mentioned and stated: Now, for and in consideration of the premises, the said John Perkins hath given, granted, and donated, and doth by these presents give, grant, and donate, unto the said Board of Directors, and their successors in office, the sum of fifty thousand dollars;" * * * * "under the following conditions, purposes, objects, plans, restrictions, and stipulations; that is to say: First, as we live in an age in which the most insidious attacks are made upon revealed religion through the natural sciences; and as it becomes the Church, at all times, to have men capable of defending the faith once delivered to the Church, it is the object and design of the said John Perkins, and it is hereby ordered, and directed, and made, by these presents, one of the conditions, restrictions, and stipulations of said gift, that thirty thousand dollars of the same shall be vested, as a permanent fund, for the endowment of a professorship in said Theological Seminary, of the Natural Sciences as connected with Revealed Religion."* In October, November, and December, of the same year (1859), the Synods of South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, in accordance with your recommendation, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That in accordance with the conditions annexed to the generous donation of Judge Perkins, there be added to the existing departments of instruction in the Seminary, a chair, to be entitled the Perkins Professorship

* Minutes of Synod of South Carolina, 1859, p. 43.

of Natural Science in connexion with Revelation; the design of which shall be to evince the harmony of science with the records of our faith, and to refute the objections of infidel naturalists."

And thus the establishment of the chair was completed; and that, without trenching upon the ordinary resources of the Church; but attended, rather, by such a consecration of wealth to the service of God as is well fitted to stimulate others to devote, in a similar manner, freely, and during their life-time, and while that which they give is still their own, the substance which they have received from the bountiful hand of God. To Mississippi, exclusively, is the Seminary indebted for it; inasmuch as it originated in the efforts of Dr. Lyon, in the Presbytery of Tombeckbee; it was cordially recommended by the Synod of Mississippi; and its ample pecuniary basis was provided by the distinguished citizen of Mississippi, whose honored name it bears. Thus, immediately after the Synod of Alabama had adopted the "Seminary as their own, to cherish and care for, support, help, and encourage it," the sister State on her western border made good her claim to it as her own, too, in an eminently practical and praiseworthy manner.

The Synod of Georgia, to which belonged the choice of the professor, postponed the election for a year, assigning as the reason, that the Synod "feels so deeply the responsibility of proceeding to an election which will be final, and which will involve so much the future character of our Theological Seminary," that it "decides that it is for the best interests of our Church to pause, and postpone an election to said professorship, until our next regular annual meeting, in 1860." At that meeting, they made their choice. And now, Fathers and Brethren of the Board of Directors, though with many misgivings, and with anxious solicitude lest I prove unable to occupy properly the posi-

tion assigned me, I have obeyed the call, and have come to ask your further counsel for my direction, if I have in any respect failed to understand the designs of the Church.

The general design is evident enough: but there are at least three methods by which it may be executed; and hence arises the doubt: for it may be intended that each shall receive equal attention, and the special objects of each be aimed at; or only one of them, to the exclusion of the others; or one chiefly, and the others subordinately. In the first place, the harmony in question may be evinced by showing that science proves the existence of God, and that He has attributes identical, as far as she reveals them, with such as are ascribed to Him in His word. From the observation, both of the "general order prevailing in the material world," and of the "special adaptations" of objects to the purposes which they are to serve, the being and the unity of God may be inferred, and also His wisdom, power, and goodness. If we proceed in this direction, the work will be to present the outlines of Natural Theology, as ordinarily understood, and to compare its doctrines with those of Revealed Theology: to develop the Apostle's declaration, that "the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead"; to examine how the heavens, and all His other wonderful works, "declare the glory of God."

In the next place, the harmony may be evinced by observing the analogy which subsists between nature and revelation, in other respects than those which it belongs to natural theology to consider. From the analogy observed between them, from the "identity of their style," and from the similarity of the difficulties in each, it becomes evident that both have proceeded from the same hand. In pursuing this course, natural science is found to present much, which, while it might be presumptuous to say that it confirms the truths of revelation, at least

illustrates them, and enables us to understand them more clearly, to grasp them more firmly, and to overcome objections which might otherwise be perplexing. When we have been habituated to contemplate the almost illimitable extent of creation, and its almost immeasurable past duration, which science makes known, the words, infinite and eternal, are of vastly grander significance to us, although we still utterly fail to comprehend them in their fullness. When we have been listening to the lessons of science concerning the care which the Creator takes of all his creatures, down to the minutest, and those which we so often proudly regard as beneath our notice, we must find it easier to understand the lessons of the Word concerning His constant provident watchfulness in our behalf. When we have become familiar with the numerous interruptions of absolute uniformity in the flow of events in the history of our earth, and with the beginnings of new orders of things, which science reveals to us, so entirely independent of the antecedent ordinary course of nature, the objections of the subtle sophist to the possibility of the miracles by which the Word is authenticated, can not give us any uneasiness; for they are too palpably inconsistent with what we thus come to know of other departments of God's government. We are, indeed, rather led to anticipate that there will be in the moral world extraordinary events, which we can not assign to ordinary causes, just as there have so often been in the material world. Science further illustrates, in numberless ways, many other truths of revelation; and when it fails to do this, when it fails to throw light upon the mysteries contained in the Word, it presents us with other mysteries of its own, which must, at least, effectually keep us back from the folly of rejecting the Word, because of its sayings dark and hard to be understood.

In the third place, it may be the design of the professorship to evince the harmony only where it has been

doubted or denied, or where opinions prevailing among scientific men either are, or are supposed to be, inconsistent with our sacred records; in other words, to scrutinize the nature and the force of current and popular objections to the Scriptures; to meet them, and to set them aside, by proving that they spring either from science falsely so called, or from incorrect interpretations of the words of the Holy Bible. This would involve a careful study of the fundamental principles of the various branches of science from which the objections are drawn, and of their details, carried far enough to enable one to judge correctly of the amount of truth in each objection. It would involve, further, the careful study of the principles of biblical interpretation, as far as these relate to the mode in which the works of God are spoken of. The comparison of the results obtained thus, if the processes have been properly conducted, must inevitably evince entire harmony, or, at least, the entire absence of discord.

Now, it is this last which I regard as constituting the field on which most labor is to be expended; not that the first two are to be wholly neglected: but this chiefly embraces the duties of the professorship.

If this view is the true one, it will be proper to look more closely at some of the details included in the plan. What, then, are some of the leading points of supposed antagonism between science and revelation?

It is affirmed, on the one hand, that the Sacred Scriptures explicitly teach that the heavens and the earth, embracing the whole material universe, were brought out of absolute non-existence not quite six thousand years ago; and that, from the time when matter began to exist, from the first beginning of creation, until the creation of the first human being, not quite six days elapsed; that the work of creating and preparing this earth to be the abode of man, and of creating all animals that have ever existed, with man at their head, was begun, carried on, and ended, within the

first six days of time. On the other hand, it is maintained that we learn, from the investigation of the structure of the earth, and of the causes by which the peculiarities of its structure have been produced, that, instead of six days, the whole period that has elapsed since the creation of man is an exceedingly minute portion of the time since the first animals, whose remains still exist, were created; and that the earth had been in existence during a period immeasurably beyond our power to measure, prior to the creation of the first living being that has left any trace of its having been an inhabitant of the earth; that the creation of man and contemporaneous animals is really one of the most recent events in the earth's history; that the world, during almost inconceivable periods of time, had been preparing for man's abode; during part of which time, it was apparently without life, and, during the rest, it was the dwelling place of successive races of organized beings, not one of which remained alive when man received it, perfectly fitted to be his home.

Intimately connected with many of the facts involved in the discussion of this point, is the question relating to the introduction of death into our world, and even into the universe. It is evident that those who maintain the views last presented, can not believe that there was no death in the world until after man had sinned. They further insist that we may be convinced that man's sin had nothing to do with the death of the lower animals, by an examination of the structure of the teeth, claws, organs of digestion, and other parts of existing carnivorous animals, which were created at the same time with man. They receive with incredulity the suggestion, that the untold myriads of animals, which they call pre-Adamic, perished in anticipation of man's sin; and they utterly reject, as equally inconsistent with natural history and the Scriptures, the supposition that the carnivorous structure may have been the result of a modification of that previously belonging to

graminivorous animals. Opposed to this is the belief that the Scriptures teach that death was utterly unknown before the fall of man; and that when we read that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin," not man's death alone is spoken of, but all death; the death of the simplest and minutest animalcule, as well as of the sinning lord of creation.

Another instance of antagonism is furnished by the opposite views respecting the Noachian deluge. The Bible, we are told, teaches, most unequivocally, that the waters of that deluge spread over the whole earth, and that they stood not less than fifteen cubits above the highest summits of the Himalayas, the Andes, the Rocky Mountains, the Alps, and the loneliest desolations of the icy Arctic deserts, never seen by human eye, as well as the highest hills and mountains of Mesopotamia, and the adjoining regions, to which man's habitations may have extended: and that the whole earth, with all its distinct zoölogical regions obliterated for the time, was entirely destitute of every breathing thing, except those preserved with Noah, and his sons, and their wives, in the ark. Others find in nature reasons which absolutely forbid their belief of such propositions. They find that the number of animals which would need the ark's protection is far beyond its capacity; that if it were not, passing by the impossibility of all existing under the same climate for a whole year, without a constant miracle, they find the geographical distribution of animals to be such that their collection, from remote continents and islands of the sea, from the burning inter-tropical deserts, and the ice-bound fastnesses around the poles, and, still more, that their re-distribution to their present homes, involves an expenditure of miracle which is incredibly disproportionate to the end in view; the destruction of corrupt mankind by a flood of waters.

The question of the unity of the human race brings to view another point of direct antagonism between some

votaries of science and all believers in the Bible. The Bible is held to teach, with a clearness that can not be misunderstood, both directly and by implication, that the whole human family is descended from the single pair, Adam and Eve; the inspired Apostle's saying is quoted, "God, that made the world and all things therein * * * hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth:" and this oneness is necessarily implied in the doctrines of original sin, the federal headship of Adam, and the atonement of Christ. It is impossible to admit any doubt as to this unity, and at the same time believe in the truth of the most vital doctrines of our religion. And yet, it is most strenuously maintained by many, of no small repute in the scientific world, that numerous branches of knowledge conspire to prove this dogma false, and to demonstrate the diversity of human origin. The white, black, red, yellow, and brown races, with many intermediate, are held to be distinct species of animals, descended from different ancestors; closely allied to one another, it may be, but not more so than many species of the lower animals, universally admitted to be distinct. This is supposed to be demonstrated by the diversities in their anatomical and physiological characteristics, and by the difference in their mental constitution; by the constancy of these diversities, as proved by pictures on the monuments of Egypt; by the determination of "the bounds of their habitations" by natural laws, just as rigidly as the bounds of the habitations of any other animals. For similar reasons, it is further maintained, not merely that the human genus has descended from many pairs of ancestors, but, also, that these were distributed geographically at the time of their introduction, as we now find their descendants.

In support of these doctrines, and others which have some connexion with natural science, several other branches of knowledge are appealed to continually; and the considera-

tion of these, as far as they are supposed to affect such doctrines, and, therefore, the truth of the Bible, may be fairly regarded as coming within the confines of this department; all the more reasonably, since they are, as regards their connexion with revelation, always classed in the popular mind with the sciences which belong to it under a stricter definition of its terms. Of this nature is a knowledge of Egypt, and her monuments and their inscriptions, which are represented as teaching many a lesson totally irreconcilable with our sacred records; and a knowledge of the antiquities of the Chinese, the Hindoos, and other Eastern nations, whose established chronology, it is claimed, sets aside, by irrefragable proofs, that of the Hebrew Scriptures as entirely worthless, the fabrication of some modern sciolist. Indeed, the whole subject of chronology, as far as it is not included within the department of biblical exegesis, and every part of archæology, with a similar exception, would, if this extension be just, also claim investigation from this chair. It would involve too minute details, if the attempt were made to enumerate the points of opposition which are alleged to exist in this direction. I will mention but one, which clearly illustrates the necessity of embracing the subjects just specified. As before stated, it is held that the Bible teaches that man was created less than six thousand years ago. In opposition to this, we are told that, although man was introduced at a late period of the earth's history, he has been in existence not less than from thirty thousand to one hundred thousand years; and that this has been proved by the archæological monuments and the authentic chronology of many nations, no less than by geology and palæontology.

These are some of the questions, showing the nature of all, which I regard it as my chief duty to examine and to discuss before the classes in the Seminary. What is the method to be pursued in doing this: in what spirit are the

investigations to be carried on: and what results may be anticipated?

It is evident that it will be impossible to ascertain whether science and revelation agree or disagree, without an intimate acquaintance with both, as far as they are to be compared. To gain this, then, would seem to be the first thing to be done. While thus engaged, the most untrammelled freedom of inquiry must be allowed; and on both classes of subjects, our decisions must be regulated by their proper evidence. In this preliminary investigation, we must neither be governed in our views of natural science by what we may have believed to be taught in the Bible; nor, on the other hand, must we do violence to the words of the Bible, under the influence of our belief in any supposed teachings of science. There must be the most unbiassed readiness to accept as truth whatever is proved. And yet, at the same time that we advance with the fullest liberty, it should be with the profoundest humility and distrust of our own powers, joined with the deepest reverence for all that God makes known to us, both in His works and His word. Under the influence of such feelings, and proceeding with the firm conviction that truth, like its Author, is ONE, we can hardly fail to make progress in all attainable knowledge; while we will be kept from the folly of believing that there are real inconsistencies, demonstrating error on one side or other, merely because we have not succeeded in comprehending the actual mode in which the different sections of the truth are related to each other. Believing firmly and cordially that every part of the Bible is the very word of God, and that, therefore, every part of it is absolutely true, in the sense in which it was the design of its real Author, the Holy Spirit, that it should be understood, I also firmly believe that nothing will be found inconsistent with it in the established teachings of natural science: I do not say, of nature; for with my unwavering confidence in the truth of the Bible, I

would regard that as a mere truism, the utterance of which would be superfluous; but, of natural science, as it is expounded by its own votaries, and as its propositions are determined according to its own laws of investigation. Contradiction would necessarily imply a want of truth some where; but this, I think it may be made to appear, by the most rigorous reasoning, does not exist. And in all cases where there are still unadjusted apparent differences, which, it must be admitted, do exist, it can be shown that it is infinitely more probable that they result from imperfect understanding of the meaning of the Word, or of the bearing of the scientific truth, or both, than from any real inconsistency. There are independent propositions in intellectual and moral science, and even in theology, which are seemingly inconsistent, and almost contradictory; and yet we never think of abandoning our belief in any of them, if each stands on a firm basis of its own. In no case do the imperfectly understood relations under consideration present more serious difficulties than these, and very seldom as serious. I further believe that there is no seeming discrepancy, where the denial of the truth on either side would not involve vastly more perplexing embarrassment than its reception on both. We have nothing to fear for the records of our faith from the freest examination in every direction. Let antiquity be searched; let the created universe be scrutinized, as far as the human intellect, so gifted by its Creator, can reach: though in the process we will see many errors which have clung around our own minds, and which may have prevented our seeing the meaning of the Divine word, that Word will derive continually new lustre from every advance in knowledge, and unbelievers will at each step be more and more without excuse for their irrational doubts.

In seeking to obtain and to impart a suitable acquaintance with natural science, it will be proper, first of all, to examine the logical and philosophical basis upon which its

branches rest. In the analysis of every science, we come at last to certain principles on which the whole fabric is founded, and on whose truth the entire trustworthiness of the whole depends. These first principles can not, in any case, be established by ordinary reasoning; but must be such that they command the assent of every rational being, as soon as they are stated and understood. After having carefully scrutinized these first truths, and rejected all that can not endure the proper tests, and determined the limits of the applicability of such as are retained, it will be necessary to pass in review the doctrines of the several sciences concerned, and to weigh the evidence in favor of each, and the objections against each, so as to ascertain, as accurately as possible, the exact amount of confidence that is to be placed in them. We will, doubtless, in such an examination, find much that we must receive as certainly true; much that is certainly false, or, at least, wholly unproven; with much that presents such evidence as to leave us in doubt. Under the first head, I would place the teachings of geology respecting the antiquity of the earth, and the gradual nature of the processes by which the Creator brought it into its present condition: under the second, I would place the teachings of such ethnologists as deny the specific unity of the human family, and of those who maintain the extreme antiquity of man: under the third, I would place all that affects the character and extent of the Noachian deluge.

In all these preliminary discussions and investigations, only such evidence and arguments as strictly belong to science should be admitted; and these should be allowed to produce their legitimate effects, without regard to possible difficulties in which our conclusions may entangle us. Our cross-examination of the witness should be conducted with the design of learning exactly what he knows; of eliciting this knowledge from him unbiassed by any fear of evil to himself in consequence of his utterances, or of evil

to either of the parties, since we examine him as judges, and not as advocates. And we must not estimate the truthfulness of the witness himself by the correspondence of his testimony with our preconceived notions; but these we must change as his evidence requires, if his character for undoubted veracity has been previously established by the proper tests.

In the next stage of our inquiry, the absolute truth of the ascertained text of the Bible is assumed, as having been demonstrated in other departments of instruction; and the sole object here will be the determination of its meaning, by the application of judicious and established rules of interpretation. Here, as before, it will be grossly improper to attempt to make the language bear any construction inconsistent with these rules; to torture it into accordance with our preconceived opinions of its meaning, or with what we believe to be true in science. In all interpretation, we ought, assuredly, to have recourse to the fullest attainable knowledge of the subjects spoken of, derived from every source. And while it is true that we must interpret Scripture by its own laws, it is not less true that we can apply these more efficiently, and with less liability to error, in cases where we have some previous acquaintance with the topics introduced. We are clearly aided in understanding all that relates to the tribes and nations mentioned, by a knowledge of their manners and customs; by geography, in all geographical allusions; by astronomy, where the stars are concerned; by zoölogy and phytology, where animals and plants are alluded to; and so in other cases. We are not to try the truth of the Bible, certainly, by its supposed agreement or disagreement with the teachings of these sciences; but we may, and we must, accept all the aid that they can bring us. This is not denied, with regard to the subjects just mentioned; but when other sciences, equally well established, are added, there is sometimes immediate dissent. This

dissent would be quite justifiable, were the attempt made to force the Bible to speak in the language of science. To do this would be quite as unreasonable as the attempt, which is so frequently made, to force science to utter that which will accord with our views of the meaning of the Bible; and it should be strenuously resisted. But I see no reason why we should not accept this external assistance in doubtful cases; nor do I see why the assistance should be accepted, where some scientific principles are concerned; and rejected, when it is offered by others equally well proven. If it be objected to these views, that if science can be justified in its rejection of aid from the Bible, by the same reasoning it may be shown that the Bible should refuse all aid from science; it is replied that this would be just, were the question of the truth of the Bible on trial; that must be determined by rules of evidence with which natural science can have very little to do. But the objection is manifestly without foundation, when we remember that the natural sciences are based upon principles which it would be foreign to the design of the Bible to teach, and upon material phenomena which it would be unreasonable to expect to find recorded there in scientific form; while, on the other hand, the incidental allusions, throughout the sacred volume, to natural objects, whose very incidental character it is that renders them unavailable to science as formal descriptions of phenomena, presuppose some knowledge of that to which reference is made, and make necessary the application of that knowledge, before the allusions can be understood.

When we come, in the third stage, to compare the results of these two independent lines of inquiry, we ought to expect to find perfect accordance only in case we are perfectly certain that we have reached the absolute truth in science, and that the meaning which we attach to the language of the Bible is indubitably the true one. But how far are we from this position in both directions? As we

have seen, there is much that passes under the name of science that is only probable, at the best; and much that, while it seems possibly true, as long as it is viewed by itself, is shown to be wholly impossible as soon as the scope of vision becomes broader. And who will say that it is otherwise with our interpretations of the Bible? Not, certainly, that there is any doubt as to its meaning when it describes the relations of the Almighty Creator to the universe, His handiwork; or the ruined and miserable condition of man, the sinner; or the coming, and the life, the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of our blessed Divine Redeemer; or the way in which the gift of salvation is imparted to man, and the agency of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity, in sanctifying his soul; or the blessedness of the redeemed, in that presence where there is fullness of joy. In all that relates to these points, and to all the attributes of God, which He intended that we should know, the meaning of the Word is so clear that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. But, whenever we turn aside from these broad tracks of light, we find that the diversity of view on every subject, among those who receive and love the saving truth, proves but too clearly how difficult it must be to reach the exact meaning of that which is revealed. How much more must this be the case with regard to material objects, to which the references are but casual, and without any direct bearing whatever upon the main subject of discourse? Who will venture to assert dogmatically that he has found the exact and full meaning of that which is thus casually introduced? And yet, such is the character of a large portion of the points by which revelation is supposed to be connected with science.

With regard to the record of creation, it may fairly be questioned whether it is possible to convey to us in human language an intelligible account of its mode and its details. To be intelligible, it must be conveyed in language whose

meaning has been previously determined by common use. This determination has been effected by the application of particular words and expressions to known objects and processes. Now, it may well be supposed that the work of creation is so entirely different, in every respect, from any thing which it is possible for us to observe, and thus become acquainted with, and from the ordinary course of change, and the relations in which material objects stand to each other and to intelligent beings, on all which language is founded, that a knowledge of its details can no more be communicated to us than a knowledge of the nature and properties of light can be communicated to the blind. But, however this may be, there is no difficulty in the way of imparting a knowledge of the fact of the creation, and of all its moral bearings, as far as they affect us. But when we seek to go farther, the state of the case may be analogous to our knowledge of the trinity of persons in the Godhead; the fact we know, and its moral import to us; but the exact nature of the personality, and the mode of the union, we do not know; and it is more than probable that these could not be made known to us by human language.

In view of these considerations; the imperfect character of science; the doubt which must hang around many of our interpretations of the Bible, on account of the brief, and therefore obscure, descriptions to be interpreted; and the probability that language may not be adequate to convey the ideas for which we may be looking, and which we may infer it is no part of the design of the Holy Spirit to present; we may expect to find many unadjusted differences, instead of perfectly established harmony. When the comparison is made in the manner described, our surprise will be to find that there are so few apparent discrepancies; and, further, that the number of points of certain connexion of any kind is so small. Complete success, in the work you have given me to do, would be attained, if the real

relationship were positively determined in every case, and this were to be shown to be perfect identity or visible harmony. Whether or not this will ever be attainable, I know not. I, at least, do not hope for it, and I will regard myself as having discharged my duty, and fulfilled all reasonable requirements, when I succeed in presenting one or more possible and probable views of the existing relations, compatible with belief of the truth of both; and have proved that the reception of these involves infinitely less difficulty than any doubt of the truth of the Bible: thus showing, with regard to each point in succession, that it furnishes no one with the slightest excuse for rejecting that which we love and confide in as the word of God.

In conducting such investigations, and in defending the word of God against attacks based upon natural science, we ought to be continually on our guard against a dogmatic adherence to opinions which may not be well founded, and the denunciation as infidel of whatever differs from our own; and, also, against a facile acceptance of every novel and attractive hypothesis which may spring up in the field of science. We are warned of the danger to which we are here exposed, by the history of past controversies, and of embittered contests between interpretations of the Scriptures and views of nature, all of which are now acknowledged to be erroneous. The chief danger seems to have arisen from a disposition which has manifested itself in every age, and which, unhappily, too often evinces its continued existence up to the present day, to regard every mention of material objects as couched in the current scientific language of the day; and from the groundless belief that the sacred volume, besides being fitted to accomplish its chief and highest ends, is also a text-book containing the whole body of scientific truth of every kind, as well as the most authentic and instructive history of human affairs, and the collection of the sublimest and sweetest strains of poetry in existence.

I confess myself unable to understand how a proposition can be theologically true and scientifically false, when both the theology and the science are accepted as true; but this does not prevent my perceiving that the statement may be true, when understood in one sense, and false, when understood in another; and the consequent impropriety of attributing the one meaning to it, when the other is designed. If any one tells us that the sun stands still for a certain period in the winter, and again in the summer, we would hardly be justifiable in replying that there is a gross mistake implied in the assertion; that he must be ignorant of modern astronomy; that it stands still all the time. And should we have reason to receive the statement as certainly true, we would not think of making it the basis of a new astronomy, of which one of the principles would be, that at certain periods of the year, called the solstices, the sun is in a state of absolute rest, and during the rest of the year, it is in constant motion. If, in a case like this, we are willing to ascertain the meaning intended, surely we should be equally careful in interpreting the word of God; and should avoid taking as a formal scientific explanation of a phenomenon, that which is merely a description of it in ordinary language. Although this principle is so reasonable that no one would ever think of calling it in question, it has been in practice sadly neglected. Systems of natural science have been invented in direct violation of it; for the support of which, not only have the allusions to nature in the narrative portions of the Bible been quoted by the inventors, but also the boldest figures of its most impassioned poetry.

The danger in question exhibits itself in two forms. In the one, there is an eager desire to bring, to force, if need be, the sacred text into accordance with the last doubtful utterance of science, and an impatient contempt towards all who will not at once accept as demonstrated the newly discovered harmony. In the other, although there is pro-

fessed a distrust of all natural science, there is a no less real accommodation of the interpretation to the somewhat antiquated and distorted form of science which has reached the less educated classes of mankind; and this is represented as interpreting the Word by its own light; assigning to it just such a meaning as it would seem fitted to convey to the unlettered, unbiassed mind of a plain, unsophisticated, honest inquirer after truth. In whatever form it may appear, we can not be too careful in guarding against its influence; whether it would lead us to commit the Word to new hypotheses on the outskirts of science, in the region of the undetermined, or to old guesses, which have long been exploded and abandoned. Profiting by the lessons of the past, we will require ample proof of the incorrectness of an interpretation which has long been sanctioned by devout men of learning, before we give it up; and we will scrutinize, with jealous care, the evidence by which all new theories are sustained, affirming new modes of connexion; and we will hesitate long before we adopt them, in the hope that we may avoid changes which may so easily be used to bring discredit upon that which we most highly prize. But, while thus cautious in the examination and admission of all professed friends, lest they be enemies in disguise, and lest they become an element of weakness, if not actual traitors, there should be equal care taken to avoid the other extreme, of rejecting, with scornful contempt, all proffers of alliance and coöperation, and thus doing what we can to drive those who may be friends, or at least neutrals, into the ranks of the enemy. This, too, has been done, to an unfortunate extent, in all ages of the Church. There has been too often a disposition to repress all freedom of inquiry, and to denounce its results, without any impartiality of examination, as opposed to the letter and spirit of revelation. The day when the instruments used in restraining such freedom were material, has passed away; but, unhappily, others are

still used, which sometimes inflict not less pain. There still exists too much of the old spirit in the purest branches of the Church of this day; a spirit that would crush all progress in science, if such progress disturb, in the least, cherished views which may be without real foundation in the Bible, by the employment, not now of material instruments of torture, but by that which has with too much truth been denominated "*odium theologicum.*" This is utterly at variance with the spirit of Christianity and its divine charter. And it is at variance, also, with the general practice of believers in the Bible; for with regard to most subjects, the utmost encouragement is given to the seeker after increased knowledge; and very properly, since every new discovery is found to be an additional illustration of the glory of God. Such encouragement should be given to every inquiry after truth. Not merely should the inquirer be tolerated; but he should have reason to know that he is regarded with approbation, and that his results will be received with candor, while they are subjected to all becoming tests, before they are adopted as true; and that his name will not be cast out as evil, he will not find himself classed with unbelievers, because his views may at first sight seem to be inconsistent with received truth. Let the Church show herself the patroness of learning in every thing, as she has done already in most things; and let her never be subjected, by mistaken friends, to the charge that she fears the light, and can sustain her claims only where this is partially obstructed. Let her, through all her members, exhibit that love for the truth on every subject, which is some times directly forcibly inculcated in the Holy Scriptures, and which is so consonant with their spirit throughout.

This, then, in my opinion, is the spirit by which the incumbent of the professorship should be actuated; these are the objects to be sought, and the plan to be pursued, and the results to be expected. Direct confirmation of

the truth of revelation is not looked for; it is not needed. You can not hope to render more firm the foundation of the mountain of granite. But the fogs which hang around its base, and obscure its immovable nature, and distort, to the beholder, the symmetry of its acclivities, may be dispelled, and thus its solid foundation and true proportions be brought more clearly to view. This, I believe, the faithful discharge of the duties belonging to this chair will tend greatly to effect; success in this will constitute its triumph and its glory.

Complete success I dare not hope for at once; but I shall labor for it with at least faithful industry, and an honest desire to attain and set forth all the truth. And I look to you, and to the beloved Church which founded the Seminary of which you have been constituted Directors, and whose honor and purity should be so jealously guarded, to aid me by your counsels and your prayers, that I may be kept from teaching aught but the unadulterated and unperverted truth. And above all, I look to the Head of the Church, and to the Creator of the Universe, and to the Author of the Word, to the Triune God of truth, for that wisdom which cometh from Him alone, and by the aid of which alone need I hope to glorify Him in the position to which, I trust, He has been calling me by the voice of His Church.

ARTICLE II.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth, greeting: Grace, mercy and peace be multiplied upon you.

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN:

It is probably known to you that the Presbyteries and Synods in the Confederate States, which were formerly in connexion with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, have renounced the jurisdiction of that body, and dissolved the ties which bound them ecclesiastically with their brethren of the North. This act of separation left them without any formal union among themselves. But as they were one in faith and order, and still adhered to their old standards, measures were promptly adopted for giving expression to their unity, by the organization of a Supreme Court, upon the model of the one whose authority they had just relinquished. Commissioners, duly appointed, from all the Presbyteries of these Confederate States, met, accordingly, in the city of Augusta, on the fourth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and then and there proceeded to constitute the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States—that is to say, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship—were unan-

imously and solemnly declared to be the Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States, with no other change than the substitution of "Confederate" for "United," wherever the country is mentioned in the standards. The Church, therefore, in these seceded States, presents now the spectacle of a separate, independent and complete organization, under the style and title of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. In thus taking its place among sister Churches of this and other countries, it seems proper that it should set forth the causes which have impelled it to separate from the Church of the North, and to indicate a general view of the course, which it feels it incumbent upon it to pursue, in the new circumstances in which it is placed.

We should be sorry to be regarded by our brethren in any part of the world as guilty of schism. We are not conscious of any purpose to rend the body of Christ. On the contrary, our aim has been to promote the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. If we know our own hearts, and can form any just estimate of the motives which have governed us, we have been prompted by a sincere desire to promote the glory of God, and the efficiency, energy, harmony and zeal of His visible kingdom in the earth. We have separated from our brethren of the North as Abraham separated from Lot, because we are persuaded that the interests of true religion will be more effectually subserved by two independent Churches, under the circumstances in which the two countries are placed, than by one united body.

1. In the first place, the course of the last Assembly, at Philadelphia, conclusively shows that, if we should remain together, the political questions, which divide us as citizens, will be obtruded on our Church Courts, and discussed by Christian Ministers and Elders with all the acrimony, bitterness and rancour, with which such questions are usually discussed by men of the world. Our Assembly

would present a mournful spectacle of strife and debate. Commissioners from the Northern would meet with Commissioners from the Southern Confederacy, to wrangle over the questions which have split them into two Confederacies, and involved them in furious and bloody war. They would denounce each other, on the one hand, as tyrants and oppressors, and on the other, as traitors and rebels. The Spirit of God would take His departure from these scenes of confusion, and leave the Church lifeless and powerless, an easy prey to the sectional divisions and angry passions of its members. Two nations, under any circumstances, except those of perfect homogeneousness, can not be united in one Church, without the rigid exclusion of all civil and secular questions from its halls. Where the countries differ in their customs and institutions, and view each other with an eye of jealousy and rivalry, if national feelings are permitted to enter the Church Courts, there must be an end of harmony and peace. The prejudices of the man and the citizen will prove stronger than the charity of the Christian. When they have allowed themselves to denounce each other for their national peculiarities, it will be hard to join in cordial fellowship as members of the same spiritual family. Much more must this be the case where the nations are not simply rivals, but enemies—where they hate each other with a cruel hatred—where they are engaged in a ferocious and bloody war, and where the worst passions of human nature are stirred to their very depths. An Assembly, composed of representatives from two such countries, could have no security for peace except in a steady, uncompromising adherence to the Scriptural principle, that it would know no man after the flesh; that it would abolish the distinctions of Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, and recognize nothing but the new creature in Christ Jesus. The moment it permits itself to know the Confederate or the United States, the moment its members meet as

citizens of these countries, our political differences will be transferred to the house of God, and the passions of the forum will expel the Spirit of holy love and of Christian communion.

We can not condemn a man, in one breath, as unfaithful to the most solemn earthly interests, his country and his race, and commend him, in the next, as a loyal and faithful servant of his God. If we distrust his patriotism, our confidence is apt to be very measured in his piety. The old adage will hold here, as in other things, *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.*

The only conceivable condition, therefore, upon which the Church of the North and the South could remain together as one body, with any prospect of success, is the rigorous exclusion of the questions and passions of the forum from its halls of debate. This is what always ought to be done. The provinces of Church and State are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. The State is a natural institute, founded in the constitution of man, as moral and social, and designed to realize the idea of justice. It is the society of rights. The Church is a supernatural institute, founded in the facts of redemption, and is designed to realize the idea of grace. It is the society of the redeemed. The State aims at social order, the Church at spiritual holiness. The State looks to the visible and outward, the Church is concerned for the invisible and inward. The badge of the State's authority is the sword, by which it becomes a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well. The badge of the Church's authority is the keys, by which it opens and shuts the Kingdom of Heaven, according as men are believing or impenitent. The power of the Church is exclusively spiritual, that of the State includes the exercise of force. The constitution of the Church is a Divine revelation—the constitution of the State must be determined by human reason and the

course of Providential events. The Church has no right to construct or modify a government for the State, and the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the Church. They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined to its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world, as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter. It is true that there is a point at which their respective jurisdictions seem to meet—in the idea of duty. But even duty is viewed by each in very different lights. The Church enjoins it as obedience to God, and the State enforces it as the safeguard of order. But there can be no collision, unless one or the other blunders as to the things that are materially right. When the State makes wicked laws, contradicting the eternal principles of rectitude, the Church is at liberty to testify against them; and humbly to petition that they may be repealed. In like manner, if the Church becomes seditious, and a disturber of the peace, the State has a right to abate the nuisance. In ordinary cases, however, there is not likely to be a collision. Among a Christian people, there is little difference of opinion as to the radical distinctions of right and wrong. The only serious danger is, where moral duty is conditioned upon a political question. Under the pretext of inculcating duty, the Church may usurp the power to determine the question which conditions it, and that is precisely what she is debarred from doing. The condition must be given. She must accept it from the State, and then her own course is clear. *If* Cæsar is your master, then pay tribute to him; but whether the *if* holds; whether Cæsar is your master or not; whether he ever had any just authority; whether he now retains it, or has forfeited it; these are points which the Church has no commission to adjudicate.

Had these principles been steadily maintained by the Assembly at Philadelphia, it is possible that the ecclesiastical separation of the North and the South might have

been deferred for years to come. Our Presbyteries, many of them, clung with tenderness to the recollections of the past. Sacred memories gathered around that venerable Church which had breasted many a storm, and trained our fathers for glory. It had always been distinguished for its conservative influence, and many fondly hoped that, even in the present emergency, it would raise its placid and serene head above the tumults of popular passion, and bid defiance to the angry billows which rolled at its feet. We expected to see it bow in reverence only at the name of Jesus. Many dreamed that it would utterly refuse to know either Confederates or Federalists, and utterly refuse to give any authoritative decree without a "thus saith the Lord." It was ardently desired that the sublime spectacle might be presented of one Church upon earth, combining, in cordial fellowship and in holy love, the disciples of Jesus in different and even in hostile lands. But, alas for the weakness of man! these golden visions were soon dispelled. The first thing, which roused our Presbyteries to look the question of separation seriously in the face, was the course of the Assembly in venturing to determine, as a Court of Jesus Christ, which it did by necessary implication, the true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States as to the kind of government it intended to form. A political theory was, to all intents and purposes, propounded, which made secession a crime, the seceding States rebellious, and the citizens who obeyed them traitors. We say nothing here as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of these decrees. What we maintain is, that, whether right or wrong, the Church had no right to make them—she transcended her sphere, and usurped the duties of the State. The discussion of these questions, we are sorry to add, was in the spirit and temper of partisan declaimers. The Assembly, driven from its ancient moorings, was tossed to and fro by the waves of popular passion. Like Pilate, it obeyed the clamour of

the multitude, and, though acting in the name of Jesus, it kissed the sceptre, and bowed the knee to the mandates of Northern phrenzy. The Church was converted into the forum, and the Assembly was henceforward to become the arena of sectional divisions and national animosities.

We frankly admit that the mere unconstitutionality of the proceedings of the last Assembly is not, in itself considered, a sufficient ground of separation. It is the consequences of these proceedings, which make them so offensive. It is the door which they open for the introduction of the worst passions of human nature into the deliberations of Church Courts. The spirit of these proceedings, if allowed to prevail, would for ever banish peace from the Church, and there is no reason to hope that the tide which has begun to flow can soon be arrested. The two Confederacies hate each other more intensely now than they did in May, and if their citizens should come together upon the same floor, whatever might be the errand that brought them there, they could not be restrained from smiting each other with the fist of wickedness. For the sake of peace, therefore, for Christian charity, for the honour of the Church, and for the glory of God, we have been constrained, as much as in us lies, to remove all occasion of offence. We have quietly separated, and we are grateful to God that, while leaving for the sake of peace, we leave with the humble consciousness that we, ourselves, have never given occasion to break the peace. We have never confounded Cæsar and Christ, and we have never mixed the issues of this world with the weighty matters that properly belong to us as citizens of the Kingdom of God.

2. Though the immediate occasion of separation was the course of the General Assembly at Philadelphia in relation to the Federal Government and the war, yet there is another ground on which the independent organization of the Southern Church can be amply and scripturally main-

tained. The unity of the Church does not require a formal bond of union among all the congregations of believers throughout the earth. It does not demand a vast imperial monarchy, like that of Rome, nor a strictly universal council, like that to which the complete developement of Presbyterianism would naturally give rise. The Church catholic is one in Christ, but it is not necessarily one visible, all-absorbing organization upon earth. There is no schism where there is no breach of charity. Churches may be perfectly at one in every principle of faith and order, and yet geographically distinct, and mutually independent. As the unity of the human race is not disturbed by its division into countries and nations, so the unity of the spiritual seed of Christ is neither broken nor impaired by separation and division into various Church constitutions. Accordingly, in all Protestant countries, Church organizations have followed national lines. The Calvinistic Churches of Switzerland are distinct from the Reformed Church of France. The Presbyterians of Ireland belong to a different Church from the Presbyterians of Scotland, and the Presbyterians of America constitute Churches, in like manner, distinct from all other Churches on the globe. That the division into national Churches, that is, Churches bounded by national lines, is, in the present condition of human nature, a benefit, seems to us too obvious for proof. It realizes to the Church catholic all the advantages of a division of labour. It makes a Church organization homogeneous and compact—it stimulates holy rivalry and zeal—it removes all grounds of suspicion and jealousy on the part of the State. What is lost in expansion is gained in energy. The Church catholic, as thus divided, and yet spiritually one; divided, but not rent, is a beautiful illustration of the great philosophical principle which pervades all nature—the co-existence of the one with the many.

If it is desirable that each nation should contain a separate and an independent Church, the Presbyterians of these Confederate States need no apology for bowing to the decree of Providence, which, in withdrawing their country from the Government of the United States, has, at the same time, determined that they should withdraw from the Church of their fathers. It is not that they have ceased to love it—not that they have abjured its ancient principles, or forgotten its glorious history. It is to give these same principles a richer, freer, fuller developement among ourselves than they possibly could receive under foreign culture. It is precisely because we love that Church as it was, and that Church as it should be, that we have resolved, as far as in us lies, to realize its grand idea in the country, and under the Government, where God has cast our lot. With the supreme control of ecclesiastical affairs in our own hands, we may be able, in some competent measure, to consummate this result. In subjection to a foreign power, we could no more accomplish it than the Church in the United States could have been developed in dependence upon the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The difficulty there would have been, not the distance of Edinburgh from New York, Philadelphia or Charleston, but the difference in the manners, habits, customs, and ways of thinking; the social, civil and political institutions of the people. These same difficulties exist in relation to the Confederate and the United States, and render it eminently proper that the Church in each should be as separate and independent as the Governments.

In addition to this, there is one difference which so radically and fundamentally distinguishes the North and South, that it is becoming every day more and more apparent that the religious, as well as the secular, interests of both will be more effectually promoted by a complete and lasting separation. The antagonism of Northern and Southern sentiment on the subject of slavery, lies at the

root of all the difficulties which have resulted in the dismemberment of the Federal Union, and involved us in the horrors of an unnatural war. The Presbyterian Church in the United States has been enabled, by Divine grace, to pursue, for the most part, an eminently conservative, because a thoroughly scriptural, policy in relation to this delicate question. It has planted itself upon the word of God, and utterly refused to make slaveholding a sin, or non-slaveholding a term of communion. But, though both sections are agreed as to this general principle, it is not to be disguised that the North entertains a deep and settled antipathy to slavery itself, while the South is equally zealous in its defence. Recent events can have no other effect than to confirm the antipathy on the one hand, and strengthen the attachment on the other. The Northern section of the Church stands in the awkward predicament of maintaining, in one breath, that slavery is an evil which ought to be abolished, and of asserting, in the next, that it is not a sin to be visited by exclusion from the communion of the saints. The consequence is, that it plays partly into the hands of abolitionists, and partly into the hands of slaveholders, and weakens its influence with both. It occupies the position of a prevaricating witness, whom neither party will trust. It would be better, therefore, for the moral power of the Northern section of the Church to get entirely quit of the subject. At the same time, it is intuitively obvious that the Southern section of the Church, while even partially under the control of those who are hostile to slavery, can never have free and unimpeded access to the slave population. Its ministers and elders will always be liable to some degree of suspicion. In the present circumstances, Northern alliance would be absolutely fatal. It would utterly preclude the Church from a wide and commanding field of usefulness. This is too dear a price to be paid for a nominal union. We can not afford to give up these millions of souls, and consign them,

so far as our efforts are concerned, to hopeless perdition, for the sake of preserving an outward unity which, after all, is an empty shadow. If we would gird ourselves heartily, and in earnest, for the work which God has set before us, we must have the control of our ecclesiastical affairs, and declare ourselves separate and independent.

And here we may venture to lay before the Christian world our views, as a Church, upon the subject of slavery. We beg a candid hearing.

In the first place, we would have it distinctly understood that, in our ecclesiastical capacity, we are neither the friends nor the foes of slavery; that is to say, we have no commission either to propagate or abolish it. The policy of its existence or non-existence is a question which exclusively belongs to the State. We have no right, as a Church, to enjoin it as a duty, or to condemn it as a sin. Our business is with the duties which spring from the relation; the duties of the masters on the one hand, and of their slaves on the other. These duties we are to proclaim and to enforce with spiritual sanctions. The social, civil, political problems connected with this great subject, transcend our sphere, as God has not entrusted to His Church the organization of society, the construction of Governments, nor the allotment of individuals to their various stations. The Church has as much right to preach to the monarchies of Europe, and the despotisms of Asia, the doctrines of republican equality, as to preach to the Governments of the South the extirpation of slavery. This position is impregnable, unless it can be shown that slavery is a sin. Upon every other hypothesis, it is so clearly a question for the State, that the proposition would never, for a moment, have been doubted, had there not been a foregone conclusion in relation to its moral character. Is slavery, then, a sin?

In answering this question, as a Church, let it be distinctly borne in mind that the only rule of judgment is the

written word of God. The Church knows nothing of the intuitions of reason or the deductions of philosophy, except as these are reproduced in the Sacred Canon. She has a positive constitution in the Holy Scriptures, and has no right to utter a single syllable upon any subject, except as the Lord puts words in her mouth. She is founded, in other words, upon express *revelation.* Her creed is an authoritative testimony of God, and not a speculation; and what she proclaims, she must proclaim with the infallible certitude of faith, and not with the hesitating assent of an opinion. The question, then, is brought within a narrow compass: Do the Scriptures, directly or indirectly, condemn slavery as a sin? If they do not, the dispute is ended, for the Church, without forfeiting her character, dares not go beyond them.

Now, we venture to assert that, if men had drawn their conclusions upon this subject only from the Bible, it would no more have entered into any human head to denounce slavery as a sin, than to denounce monarchy, aristrocracy, or poverty. The truth is, men have listened to what they falsely considered as primitive intuitions, or as necessary deductions from primitive cognitions, and then have gone to the Bible to confirm the crotchets of their vain philosophy. They have gone there determined to find a particular result, and the consequence is, that they leave with having made, instead of having interpreted, Scripture. Slavery is no new thing. It has not only existed for ages in the world, but it has existed, under every dispensation of the covenant of grace, in the Church of God. Indeed, the first organization of the Church as a visible society, separate and distinct from the unbelieving world, was inaugurated in the family of a slaveholder. Among the very first persons to whom the seal of circumcision was affixed, were the slaves of the father of the faithful, some born in his house, and others bought with his money. Slavery, again, re-appears under the Law. God sanctions

it in both the tables of the Decalogue, and Moses treats it as an institution to be regulated, not abolished; legitimated, and not condemned. We come down to the age of the New Testament, and we find it again in the Churches founded by the Apostles under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost. These facts are utterly amazing, if slavery is the enormous sin which its enemies represent it to be. It will not do to say that the Scriptures have treated it only in a general, incidental way, without any clear implication as to its moral character. Moses, surely, made it the subject of express and positive legislation, and the Apostles are equally explicit in inclulcating the duties which spring from both sides of the relation. They treat slaves as bound to obey, and inculcate obedience as an office of religion—a thing wholly self-contradictory, if the authority exercised over them were unlawful and iniquitous.

But what puts this subject in a still clearer light, is the manner in which it is sought to extort from the Scriptures a contrary testimony. The notion of direct and explicit condemnation is given up. The attempt is, to show that the genius and spirit of Christianity are opposed to it—that its great cardinal principles of virtue are utterly against it. Much stress is laid upon the Golden Rule, and upon the general denunciations of tyranny and oppression. To all this we reply, that no principle is clearer than that a case positively excepted can not be included under a general rule. Let us concede, for a moment, that the law of love, and the condemnation of tyranny and oppression, seem logically to involve, as a result, the condemnation of slavery; yet, if slavery is afterwards expressly mentioned and treated as a lawful relation, it obviously follows, unless Scripture is to be interpreted as inconsistent with itself, that slavery is, by necessary implication, excepted. The Jewish law forbade, as a general rule, the marriage of a man with his brother's wife. The same law expressly enjoined the same marriage in a given case. The given

case was, therefore, an exception, and not to be treated as a violation of the general rule. The law of love has always been the law of God. It was enunciated by Moses, almost as clearly as it was enunciated by Jesus Christ. Yet, notwithstanding this law, Moses and the Apostles alike sanctioned the relation of slavery. The conclusion is inevitable, either that the law is not opposed to it, or that slavery is an excepted case. To say that the prohibition of tyranny and oppression include slavery, is to beg the whole question. Tyranny and oppression involve either the unjust usurpation or the unlawful exercise of power. It is the unlawfulness, either in its principle or measure, which constitutes the core of the sin. Slavery must, therefore, be proved to be unlawful, before it can be referred to any such category. The master may, indeed, abuse his power, but he oppresses not simply as a master, but as a wicked master.

But, apart from all this, the law of love is simply the inculcation of universal equity. It implies nothing as to the existence of various ranks and gradations in society. The interpretation which makes it repudiate slavery would make it equally repudiate all social, civil and political inequalities. Its meaning is, not that we should conform ourselves to the arbitrary expectations of others, but that we should render unto them precisely the same measure which, if we were in their circumstances, it would be reasonable and just in us to demand at their hands. It condemns slavery, therefore, only upon the supposition that slavery is a sinful relation—that is, he who extracts the prohibition of slavery from the Golden Rule, begs the very point in dispute.

We can not prosecute the argument in detail, but we have said enough, we think, to vindicate the position of the Southern Church. We have assumed no new attitude. We stand exactly where the Church of God has always stood—from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Christ,

from Christ to the Reformers, and from the Reformers to ourselves. We stand upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. Shall we be excluded from the fellowship of our brethren in other lands, because we dare not depart from the charter of our faith? Shall we be branded with the stigma of reproach, because we can not consent to corrupt the word of God to suit the intuitions of an infidel philosophy? Shall our names be cast out as evil, and the finger of scorn pointed at us, because we utterly refuse to break our communion with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; with Moses, David, and Isaiah; with Apostles, Prophets and Martyrs; with all the noble army of confessors who have gone to glory from slaveholding countries, and from a slaveholding Church, without ever having dreamed that they were living in mortal sin, by conniving at slavery in the midst of them? If so, we shall take consolation in the cheering consciousness that the Master has accepted us. We may be denounced, despised, and cast out of the Synagogues of our brethren. But, while they are wrangling about the distinctions of men, according to the flesh, we shall go forward in our Divine work, and confidently anticipate that, in the great day, as the consequence of our humble labours, we shall meet millions of glorified spirits, who have come up from the bondage of earth to a nobler freedom than human philosophy ever dreamed of. Others, if they please, may spend their time in declaiming on the tyranny of earthly masters; it will be our aim to resist the real tyrants which oppress the soul—Sin and Satan. These are the foes against whom we shall find it employment enough to wage a successful war. And to this holy war it is the purpose of our Church to devote itself with redoubled energy. We feel that the souls of our slaves are a solemn trust, and we shall strive to present them faultless and complete before the presence of God.

Indeed, as we contemplate their condition in the Southern States, and contrast it with that of their fathers before them, and that of their brethren, in the present day, in their native land, we can not but accept it as a gracious Providence, that they have been brought in such numbers to our shores, and redeemed from the bondage of barbarism and sin. Slavery, to them, has certainly been overruled for the greatest good. It has been a link in the wondrous chain of Providence, through which many sons and daughters have been made heirs of the heavenly inheritance. The Providential result is, of course, no justification, if the thing is intrinsically wrong; but it is certainly a matter of devout thanksgiving, and no obscure intimation of the will and purpose of God, and of the consequent duty of the Church. We can not forbear to say, however, that the general operation of the system is kindly and benevolent; it is a real and effective discipline, and without it, we are profoundly persuaded that the African race in the midst of us can never be elevated in the scale of being. As long as that race, in its comparative degradation, co-exists, side by side with the white, bondage is its normal condition.

As to the endless declamation about human rights, we have only to say that human rights are not a fixed, but a fluctuating quantity. Their sum is not the same in any two nations on the globe. The rights of Englishmen are one thing, the rights of Frenchmen another. There is a minimum without which a man can not be responsible; there is a maximum which expresses the highest degree of civilization and of Christian culture. The education of the species consists in its ascent along this line. As you go up, the number of rights increases, but the number of individuals who possess them diminishes. As you come down the line, rights are diminished, but the individuals are multiplied. It is just the opposite of the predicamental scale of the logicians. There, comprehension

diminishes as you ascend, and extension increases, and comprehension increases as you descend, and extension diminishes. Now, when it is said that slavery is inconsistent with human rights, we crave to understand what point in this line is the slave conceived to occupy. There are, no doubt, many rights which belong to other men—to Englishmen, to Frenchmen, to his master, for example—which are denied to him. But is he fit to possess them? Has God qualified him to meet the responsibilities which their possession necessarily implies? His place in the scale is determined by his competency to fulfil its duties. There are other rights which he certainly possesses, without which he could neither be human nor accountable. Before slavery can be charged with doing him injustice, it must be shown that the minimum which falls to his lot, at the bottom of the line, is out of proportion to his capacity and culture—a thing which can never be done by abstract speculation. The truth is, the education of the human race for liberty and virtue, is a vast Providential scheme, and God assigns to every man, by a wise and holy decree, the precise place he is to occupy in the great moral school of humanity. The scholars are distributed into classes, according to their competency and progress. For God is in history.

To avoid the suspicion of a conscious weakness of our cause, when contemplated from the side of pure speculation, we may advert for a moment to those pretended intuitions, which stamp the reprobation of humanity upon this ancient and hoary institution. We admit that there are primitive principles in morals which lie at the root of human consciousness. But the question is, how are we to distinguish them? The subjective feeling of certainty is no adequate criterion, as that is equally felt in reference to crotchets and hereditary prejudices. The very point is, to know when this certainty indicates a primitive cognition, and when it does not. There must, therefore, be some

external test, and whatever can not abide that test, has no authority as a primary truth. That test is an inward necessity of thought, which, in all minds, at the proper stage of maturity, manifests itself as absolutely universal. Whatever is universal, is natural. We are willing that slavery should be tried by this standard. We are willing to abide by the testimony of the race; and if man, as man, has every where condemned it—if all human laws have prohibited it as crime—if it stands in the same category with malice, murder, and theft, then we are willing, in the name of humanity, to renounce it, and to renounce it for ever. But what if the overwhelming majority of mankind have approved it? what if philosophers and statesmen have justified it, and the laws of all nations acknowledged it? what then becomes of these luminous intuitions? They are an *ignis fatuus*, mistaken for a star.

We have now, brethren, in a brief compass, for the nature of this address admits only of an outline, opened to you our whole hearts upon this delicate and vexed subject. We have concealed nothing. We have sought to conciliate no sympathy by appeals to your charity. We have tried our cause by the word of God; and, though protesting against its authority to judge in a question concerning the duty of the Church, we have not refused to appear at the tribunal of reason. Are we not right, in view of all the preceding considerations, in remitting the social, civil and political problems connected with slavery to the State? Is it not a subject, save in the moral duties which spring from it, which lies beyond the province of the Church? Have we any right to make it an element in judging of Christian character? Are we not treading in the footsteps of the flock? Are we are not acting as Christ and His Apostles have acted before us? Is it not enough for us to pray and labour, in our lot, that all men may be saved, without meddling, as a Church, with the technical distinction of their civil life? We leave the matter with you. We offer you

the right hand of fellowship. It is for you to accept it or reject it. We have done our duty. We can do no more. Truth is more precious than union, and if you cast us out as sinners, the breach of charity is not with us, as long as we walk according to the light of the written Word.

The ends which we propose to accomplish as a Church, are the same as those which are proposed by every other Church. To proclaim God's truth as a witness to the nations; to gather His elect from the four corners of the earth, and through the Word, Ministry, and Ordinances, to train them for eternal life, is the great business of His people. The only thing that will be at all peculiar to us is, the manner in which we shall attempt to discharge our duty. In almost every department of labour, except the pastoral care of congregations, it has been usual for the Church to resort to societies more or less closely connected with itself, and yet logically and really distinct. It is our purpose to rely upon the regular organs of our government, and executive agencies directly and immediately responsible to them. We wish to make the Church, not merely a superintendent, but an agent. We wish to develope the idea that the congregation of believers, as visibly organized, is the very society or corporation which is divinely called to do the work of the Lord. We shall, therefore, endeavour to do what has never yet been adequately done—bring out the energies of our Presbyterian system of government. From the Session to the Assembly, we shall strive to enlist all our Courts, as Courts, in every department of Christian effort. We are not ashamed to confess that we are intensely Presbyterian. We embrace all other denominations in the arms of Christian fellowship and love, but our own scheme of government we humbly believe to be according to the pattern shown in the Mount, and, by God's grace, we propose to put its efficiency to the test.

Brethren, we have done. We have told you who we are, and what we are. We greet you in the ties of Christian

brotherhood. We desire to cultivate peace and charity with all our fellow-Christians throughout the world. We invite to ecclesiastical communion all who maintain our principles of faith and order. And now we commend you to God, and the Word of His grace. We devoutly pray that the whole catholic Church may be afresh baptized with the Holy Ghost, and that she may speedily be stirred up to give the Lord no rest until He establish and make Jerusalem a praise in the earth.

ARTICLE III.

THE ART OF CONVERSATION.

At the outset, we ask pardon of this grave Quarterly, for thrusting upon its dignity a rambling paper, suited rather to the pages of a purely literary journal. Perhaps, in the end, we shall discover it sufficiently fruitful in its suggestions of profitable morality: at any rate, a theme which could engage a Cowper's muse, and point his gentle satire, may not be despised as beneath the condescension even of this right reverend Periodical.

It would be the superfluity of labour to argue here that man is a *social* being. Even the inferior animals are said not to thrive so well in a solitary pasture, as when browsing together in a common herd; and so strong is the associating instinct, that it frequently overcomes the antipathy between hostile tribes, in cases of total exclusion from their own species. How much stronger must the social principle be in man, gifted with reason, and endowed with the divine faculty of speech, through which the domain of mind is not only enlarged, but held in common! Men are not drawn

together in society, as Hobbes paradoxically affirms, by the pressure of self-interest and prudence, but by the force of an original instinct, to which the analogy of all nature seems distinctly to point. It is, indeed, a part of their constitution, which no tyranny, however severe, can destroy; no isolation, however protracted, can extinguish. The reader will remember the illustration given by Defoe, when, upon his solitary island, Robinson Crusoe made a confidential friend of his parrot; and the still stronger case of the prisoner in the Bastile, who attached himself to the spider in his cell; and grieved, as a mother grieves for the loss of a child, when it was wantonly killed, through the malice of the jailer. So burns the heart in every human breast, that its sympathies shoot forth like the tendrils of a vine, and cling to any thing most frail on earth, that it may escape the desolation of utter loneliness. Within the entire range of philosophical speculation, no mystery is more insoluble than the adjustment between these two poles of our nature, the *individual* and the *social.* Each man is securely locked within the limits of his own personality, dwelling in the secret pavilion of his own consciousness, subject to no invasion from without, and girded with responsibilities that are absolutely irremissible; yet, at the same time, touching his fellow-man wherever he may turn, and commingling with the race as the drops unite in the waters of the sea. A microcosm, a world complete within himself; yet depending, for all improvement, upon social discipline, and for all happiness, upon social communion. He can not perfect his own nature in the privacy and seclusion of his own being. It is as natural for him to love, as to think or to breathe. If he lock up his affections within his own breast, he pays the forfeit of disobedience to the great social law of the universe, in a blighted soul mildewing beneath the lichen and moss which cover its ruins. His intellectual and moral faculties lie dormant, in the deep abyss of his own nature, until evoked by social intercourse;

just as sparks of fire lie concealed in the cold flint till struck out by contact with the steel. How beautifully is this philosophy embalmed in the flowing verse of Pope:

> "Heaven forming each on other to depend,
> A master, or a servant, or a friend,
> Bids each on other for assistance call,
> Till one man's weakness grows the strength of all;
> Wants, frailties, passions, closer still ally
> The common interest, or endear the tie:
> To these we owe true friendship, love sincere,
> Each homefelt joy that life inherits here."

Thus, no man liveth to himself. Society, like the ocean, heaves beneath its mighty tides, and its separate waves, shouldering against each other, sparkle with a phosphorescent light which is extinguished in the stagnant calm.

Political economy teaches that material products derive their value from barter and exchange. The earth is divided into zones and climates, that there may be no perpetuated schism between the races of mankind. Diversity of wants induces that mutual interchange and supply, by which the families of man are drawn together in bonds of brotherhood. The staple, for example, which blooms upon our Southern fields, is but a useless weed until it is transported to the factor, who sells it to the foreign purchaser. The spinner converts it into thread, and the weaver into cloth. The merchant spreads the beautiful fabric upon his shelves; the tailor shapes it into the elegant costumes which we wear; and each prospers, in his turn, upon the new value which each imparts, as the product passes through his hand. So there is a commerce of the mind. The facts of nature lie distributed in magnificent profusion throughout the universe, which patient observation gathers up, and silent thinkers elaborate, until the accumulated treasures of science are poured forth upon the world, to form a portion of its mental wealth. Let it be remembered, however, that great thoughts lying in the mind,

like ore in the earth, do not constitute this wealth. They must be circulated as living truths, and possess an exchangeable value, before the world is enriched. The iron and the coal sleep for ever useless in their subterranean beds, till the miner sinks his shafts, draws them to the light of day, and converts them to the practical uses of life. So the sublime conceptions of poetry, the brilliant speculations of philosophy, the patient inductions of science, and all the images of beauty that fill an artist's dreams, must be rendered palpable in speech, or in the creations of the pencil and the chisel, which are the dies of the mint, impressing a marketable value upon each. They grow, in bulk and value, as they pass from mind to mind, waking up dormant thoughts in all; and, as exchangeable products, swell the volume of our common civilization and refinement. In this intellectual barter, conversation plays an humble, but most important, part: it is the coin, of larger or smaller denomination, necessary as the circulating medium. Books, indeed, are useful as the depositories of knowledge, like the secret vaults of a bank, in which the bullion is safely kept. But the bullion must be converted into coin for the purposes of exchange; and conversation, in all the degrees of the scale, from the large discourse of the schools to the small talk of the saloon, forms the medium through which knowledge is distributed, from the pennyworth of the child to the princely portion of the sage. We do not insist, in this connexion, upon the higher offices of conversation, in cementing society together, through the affections. It is the vehicle of all those courtesies and amenities of life, and of those countless sympathies by which individuals, like separate threads, are woven into a common brotherhood. It answers all the ends of argument and illustration, to signalize its power as a great distributing agent, by which the treasures of individual thought are made to flow together, and form a community of wealth.

Of all the race, it most behooves woman to excel in this art of conversation, simply because she is the organ of society, delegated to the trust, both of creating and preserving it. Society is not formed by the aggregation of individuals, but by their fusion into each other. Its unity must not be overlooked, in considering the number and separateness of its constituent elements. Even the old Atomic philosophers could not build up their world-systems, until they supplied their floating particles with indentures and protuberances, by which to hook and grapple with each other, and gave to them the contrary notions by which they should be brought into contact. So there can be no society without those differences and contrarieties in character, which spring from the opposition of sex, like the two electricities, which attract by their very contradiction. Men, for example, may assemble for ever in their conventions and clubs, may deliberate in Senate Chambers, and frame systems of union without end; but their associations of sand will speedily be disintegrated, from the want of cohesion between the particles themselves. Society, in its true and large sense, is the offspring of love, and requires, for its origin and perpetuation, that generous reciprocation of the affections, which, as woman first inspires them, are assigned to her ministry, to be protected and nourished. This is the solemnity and glory of her position, that she is the organ of all society, the representative and guardian of its interests. It exists only in her presence, and is conserved through her purity. In our superficial thinking, we style her position humble, because she is not decked with the mere trappings of place, and because the subordinate honours of life are snatched from her hands. But, in this very humility of woman is found her glory. The Olympic games, indeed, are not for her; and she may not wrestle with the athlete, nor race with the charioteer. Her voice may not thunder amidst the jar and din of senatorial debate, nor whisper the secrets of

diplomatic intrigue. She may not shout at the head of armies, nor dictate in the councils of war. She builds up no thrones; but her power is beyond that of thrones and governments—the power of persuasion—simply universal in its scope, and irresistible in its tenderness. For this reason, because she is the genius of society, the very pivot upon which it turns, she is called to excel in that science upon which, above all others, the communion and joy of society depend. Whoever else may be indifferent to the power and utility of speech, she may not; and to wield effectively this mighty instrument of social intercourse, should command her highest ambition. It is the baton of her office, her queenly sceptre—let her wield it with a queenly grace.

For all this, woman is eminently fitted by her nature. Her whole constitution, intellectual and moral—we may even add, physical, so far as a nervous irritability may be supposed to affect mental exercises—adapts her to reign supreme in this department. The quickness of her perceptions, the acuteness of her discriminations, the delicacy of her tastes, the liveliness of her fancy, the mental elasticity—bending with ease to all subjects of thought—the facility of her mental associations, and the genial sympathy of her heart, are advantages which seldom unite in any individual of the other sex. Add to these her exemption from the practical duties which devolve upon hard-working, laborious, busy man, and her obligation to excel in conversation might seem well nigh to be demonstrated. A late writer in one of the British Quarterlies accounts for the impossibility of grafting the French saloon upon the institutions of England, by this principle alone. "The Gallic race," writes he, "is preëminently an intellectual, idealistic race; the English is almost exclusively a political race, and throw themselves too vehemently into action ever to be talkers, *par excellence;* whereas, the very perfection of *la causerie* is, to promote an elegant interchange of ideas, without any

object being too ardently pursued." Substitute in this paragraph *women*, for Frenchmen, who are even more intensely idealistic, and who are further removed from that driving practicalness which leaves men no breath to talk, and the honours of the saloon must be resigned to them, without a contest.

The importance of conversation to general society being, then, assumed, the path is fairly opened to consider what conversation, as an art, fully imports; what qualities of mind and heart are needed in its cultivation; and what obstructions must be surmounted to achieve consummate excellence. Undoubtedly, the talent of conversation is, with some, an original endowment. But this only means that a happy combination of faculties exists, which renders conversation spontaneous and easy. There is a power of concentration which enables one to give his whole attention to a speaker; a readiness of apprehension, which grasps his meaning through the most imperfect half-utterance, and a rapid movement of the mind, which frames a reply as soon as the pause demands it. Through a happy faculty of generalization, one's knowledge may be so beautifully classified, and the logical habit may so place it at command, that the particular needs only to be worked from the general, and all that is required to sustain the current of thought, is supplied upon the first suggestion. Under these conditions, conversation flows quietly in its natural channel, without fatigue, simply because without the least consciousness of effort. But this is simply to say that the talent of conversation, however it may appear to be a native gift, may be cultivated indefinitely, by the discipline of those powers upon which it so obviously depends. Conversation, then, in the common acceptation of reciprocal discourse, is determined upon principles capable of a clear exposition, and which require attention and skill in their management and application.

The features which especially characterize it are *reciprocation*, and *continuity*, or *progress*. It is not a monologue, under the projectile force of a single mind. The force which it obeys is a resultant force, from the impact of combined intellects, each moving from its own side, and giving a separate direction; so that its final course is determined by the compounded influence of all. There must be reciprocity of thought and speech, or there is no commerce of the mind, enriching by exchange. Mere volubility of tongue is but a brawling torrent through some mountain gorge, whose impetuous waters are swallowed up in the sands, or are lost in the stagnant marsh; waters which bear no burden upon their bosom, nor disembogue to swell the volume of the sea. Our words must make echoes in the minds around us, which, like answering caves, must give back the sound, until the swelling reverberation shall rise above the hills, and fill the dome of heaven. Hence the exquisite tact needed to take the gauge of those with whom we are suddenly thrown in contact. The arc of the circle in which their thoughts swing, must be rapidly and accurately measured, and the points must be ascertained upon which a mutual sympathy may be enkindled. This partly explains the proverbial awkwardness which marks the first attempts at conversation, and which is hit off with rare humour by the poet:

> "The circle formed, we sit in silent state,
> Like figures drawn upon a dial-plate;
> Yes, Ma'am, and No, Ma'am, uttered softly, show,
> Every five minutes, how the minutes go;
> Each individual suffering a constraint
> Poetry may, but colours can not, paint;
> As if in close committee on the sky,
> Reports it hot or cold, or wet or dry;
> And finds a changing clime a happy source
> Of wise reflection and well-timed discourse.
> We next inquire, but softly, and by stealth,
> Like conservators of the public health,
> Of epidemic throats, if such there are,
> And coughs, and rheums, and phthisic and catarrh."

We smile at the picture, in which, perhaps, we ourselves have mournfully figured; but may do well to consider how it illustrates the nature of conversation. The embarrassment is not always due to timid modesty, nor yet to the vanity which can not be sufficiently forgetful of self. It is simply a species of social strategy, manœuvring for a position—the excruciating tuning-notes of the fiddle-bow, a prelude to the harmony. But when, after this preliminary skirmishing, a topic of common interest shall be sprung, it must be managed to mutual advantage. Each must regard the interests of his partners, not speaking all he may wish, nor having the reciprocity all on one side; but just so much as shall elicit a corresponding product from them; so that, upon dissolving the firm, the profits may be distributed in fair proportion, as the property of each.

In like manner, genuine conversation must be marked by a gradual progress of thought, verging, in steady continuity, towards an assigned goal. It proposes to itself an end, though, of course, not so determinate as in elaborate discourse. It is not rational conversation, but sheer twaddle, if destitute of this *terminus ad quam.* Whatever be the topic, the interlocutors close it up between them, as they press it forward to an appropriate conclusion. The mind must not be suffered, like a truant hound upon a false scent, to fly off upon those way-side associations of thought which are perpetually breaking from cover; but the subject, once unearthed, must be tracked through all its windings, till the spoil is yielded to the sportman's hand. Nothing can be more fatal to this progress of thought, than the indolence which permits it to drift away, swept hither and yon by every casual suggestion, like a straw in the eddy of a stream. The reader will remember the artistic skill with which Shakspeare represents these shallow and impertinent associations crowding upon a vulgar mind, in the scene where Dame Quickly recalls to the fickle memory of Falstaff his broken promise of marriage. In a single

sentence, she crowds together the Dolphin chamber and the parcel-gilt goblet by which the false knight swore, the round table and the sea-coal fire, the irruption of the butcher's wife to borrow a mess of vinegar for a dish of prawns: all these, with other details, shoal together in her speech—showing how an untrained mind, at the mercy of chance associations, sweeps 'round within a circle, and comes out nowhere. It is important, therefore, to ascertain the principles of intercommunion between different minds, the regulation of which calls for the advice of the *moralist*, no less than the rules of the *dialectician.*

The first and most essential requisite, undoubtedly, is *knowledge:* supplying the raw material, which, as the shuttle moves in the conversational loom, shall be woven into fabrics, substantial or light, as taste or the occasion may determine. "Out of nothing, nothing comes," is an adage never more profusely illustrated than when discourse is spun from empty ignorance. There may be endless talk—a bleak, barren waste of gossip—but no conversation, in the sense we have endeavoured to define. The spectacle would be grotesque, if it were not humiliating, of ignorance striving to keep up the forms of social intercourse, without resources from which contributions to the common stock may be drawn. Alas! it is often attended with consequences both melancholy and bitter. The tale of brick must be rendered, but there is no straw with which to make it. As there must be speech, gossip and scandal usurp the place of reason and thought; and, from minds not essentially malignant, a thousand waspish slanders swarm forth, and sting wherever they alight. In rural districts, where society is comparatively homogeneous, and social intercourse is not reduced to system, this evil may not sorely press. But in cities and towns, where hundreds are thrown together, an unsorted mixture—where wealth and other accidents force vulgar minds from their own parallel, to range across the breadth of a zone—

the effort to keep up even the forms of social life is some times desolating in the extreme. The homespun conversation about things understood and known, must be abandoned; and the tattling of sheer ignorance, that feels itself compelled to talk, perhaps, without a particle of malice, throws a whole community into a state of anarchy and civil war. One can scarcely refrain from wishing that these brewers of mischief might be visited with the punishment inflicted upon the dame of Narbonne, who, according to Knickerbocker, was "doomed, for her excessive volubility, to peel five hundred thousand and thirty-nine ropes of onions, and actually ran out at her eyes before half the hideous task was accomplished." The remedy for this is knowledge, affording a solid basis for all the negotiation and exchange of social intercourse. This knowledge must be comprehensive and various, embracing all that the most minute observation can collect, and the most copious reading can supply. The power of adapting ourselves to those with whom we are casually thrown in contact, depends largely upon this variety of information, which takes up the habits and pursuits of all. This, together with the requisite discrimination and tact, will put us *en rapport* with all whom we chance to meet. It is not given to any arbitrarily to choose the theme of conversation, which must often take its rise from casual suggestions, and be drifted into its channel by the circumstances of time and place, or by the characters and tastes of those with whom we associate. We must, therefore, often be at fault, if copious reading and mature reflection have not enlarged the area of our own thoughts. Nothing may be safely neglected. History, with her voluminous records; science, with all her mysteries; philosophy, with all its subtleties; belle-lettres, yielding up its flowers from a thousand beds; the whole encyclopedia of knowledge must be compassed; and from that reading, which Lord Bacon says makes a full man, conversation must flow as water

from a reservoir, simply by the pressure of its own abundance.

Let not despair lift up its hands at the gigantic task which is here imposed. We are only sketching an ideal. He who hopes to be a master of this great art must, indeed, be a Leviathan of knowledge; for, to talk discreetly with every man, upon every thing, infers that nothing is unknown. But, as there is an endless gradation in knowledge, there is a corresponding various mastery of the art we are discussing. We simply affirm the proportion between the two. Very large measures of information may be gained by every man who has opportunity and industry, and the degrees of this shall indicate, as on a scale, his ability to converse. The secret of large mental acquisitions is, *generalization.* The memory, however expanded, is incapable of sustaining an infinity of details; and if it were, it would be a confused lumber-room of unrelated facts. But science, in all her branches, has sifted and arranged these, generalizing the principles in which they are implicitly contained, and which are easily borne about with us. A wagon-load of copper pennies would yield but a modicum of wealth; yet, if summed up in bank notes, and bills of exchange, a man might transport millions in his pocket-book. The art of learning consists not only in collecting the particulars of knowledge, but in condensing these into final principles. The law of association will surprisingly assist in unpacking these bales of knowledge, and in bringing out, again, the particular from the general, as the secret spring in the wainscoting of ancient houses often threw open concealed chambers of untold riches. This habit of classifying facts, not only explains the mystery of great learning, but is intrinsically valuable, as being a sort of mental digestion, by which knowledge is assimilated, and becomes a part of the mind itself. This, too, is indispensable in conversation, which requires knowledge always at command. There is not time to draw it forth

from pigeon-holes, nicely labelled, and tied up with red tape. It must be incorporated with the substance of the mind, and scintillate, from the mind's own action, as the electric spark is given out from a charged battery. Whoever hopes, without knowledge industriously collected and systematized, to shine as a conversational star, indulges a dream, vain as any which can visit him in sleep.

We will, then, suppose one to possess all the intellectual furniture which has been described; to be familiar with the schools of philosophy, and the opinions which divide them; to be at home in all the departments of science, able to enunciate the laws by which the material universe is regulated; to have unravelled the thread of history, disentangling the complicated skein of political intrigue and diplomacy; to know the great productions of art in every age and clime; to have ranged over the whole field of polite literature, as found in the classics of his own and of other tongues; all this variety of knowledge shall, by sufficient reflection, have become so entirely his own, that he needs only to touch the spring of association any where, and it flows forth with the spontaneous and regulated fullness of an artesian jet. There remains another requisite of high conversational talent, the *facility* and *felicity of expression*, which shall convey his thoughts with precision and elegance. The *style* of conversation, no less than its *matter*, should be proposed for sedulous cultivation. The gift of the fairy should be invoked, so that pearls may drop from the lips whenever they are opened. Every species of slang, which gains currency from the broad and coarse humour in which it originates, must be excluded. We do not pause to enforce this canon, simply because the delicacy of taste imparted by intellectual culture will, by its own smelting processes, purge away these impurities, together with those rude provincialisms which mar the catholic and pure dialect of the republic of letters. But that sustained elegance of diction which forms the proper vesture of noble thoughts

can not be acquired without attention. It is the plumage of the royal bird which sustains his flight upward to the sun; and our callow thoughts must be fledged in language suited to the wing upon which they hope to soar. At the same time, this elevated diction must be free from the suspicion of elaboration. Any thing which interferes with the ease and *abandon* of conversation, begets a sense of fatigue and constraint, under which it speedily languishes. The thought must, therefore, go bounding along, never halting for expression, never pausing to put on a Court dress. In order to this, language must not only *seem*, but must actually *be*, *impromptu;* which can only be when it is the habitual style of our thinking. However severe the early efforts in its acquisition, these must have terminated in the ease and naturalness of established habit—so that to think, and to think in elegant language, shall be identical. The thought must weave around itself its appropriate style, and no clicking of the shears must suggest the tailoring by which its costume has been fashioned. No small discipline is required to move forward, in the freedom and hurry of animated conversation, upon this highest summit level of style, without descending into platitudes or tripping into negligence. Yet the difficulty is much abated by the fact that the same copious reading which supplies the material of conversation, supplies also the copious language to be employed. The mind familiar with the affluent diction of the best writers, insensibly catches their tone. Its own vocabulary is enlarged; and ten thousand images, which embellished their pages, start forth from it, warm with life and beauty. Our manners and our style we take up, as plants their color, by absorption from the light that shines around us; and may thus easily betray the company we keep among the great immortals who survive in books.

We are prepared now to consider the art of conversation on its *moral* side, as heretofore we have exhibited its *intellectual.* Here we signalize, as first in importance, a *genial*

sympathy with the society in which we move. Living words can flow only from the heart, the fountain of life. The intellect shines with a light cold as the moon-beam, and can never supply the generous warmth which shall cover society with its grateful verdure. The sensibilities of the heart must supply that sympathy with the active world around us, necessary to all true intercourse. The mere book-worm loses his ability to converse from this cause. For though, as Milton says, "books are not absolutely dead things," yet they are not the warm and living persons upon which our personal affections may be concentrated. The solitary student, therefore, dries away, almost to a mummy, in his constant association with the dead past: and his lack of genial sympathy, like the moat around a feudal castle, cuts him off from the living, breathing world around him. He moves in the midst of it like some spectre of the grave-yard, whose form beats with no pulse of a common life, and whose lips are sealed in eternal silence. An active sympathy can never be counterfeited, nor can it be conjured up by an effort of the will. It must well up spontaneously from the deep within, as the springs of affection mysteriously flow, and force it upward to the lips. It will astonish those who have never made it a subject of thought, how this sympathy flashes from the eye, or trembles in the tone—how, by an electric affinity, congenial spirits are drawn together; while the absence of it creates a vacuum through which the electric current is unable to pass. It is felt and recognized by the young child about its mother's knee, who is instinctively attracted to repose its little confidences in that mother's ear; or else repelled, to bury its disappointed love in a mournfulness—one of childhood's shadows—none the less painful because its origin is unexplored. That mother, too, needs this reciprocating sympathy to discharge the full office of a mother's training. She must let herself completely down into that infant spirit, with a freshness scarcely less than when young thoughts

and hopes first budded in her own infant breast. Thus only can she converse with her child, and, through oral discourse, commence that education which opens with the cradle, and closes only in the grave. Many unfriendly influences threaten to check this outflow of social sympathy, which must be energetically resisted. The preoccupation of mind with business, so necessary to professional success, often shuts us up in a selfish seclusion. Affliction and sorrow some times throw their early blight upon the affections, inducing a morbid depression, fatal to all elasticity of spirit. In this may be perceived the value of practical religion, which the Scriptures declare to "have the promise of the life that now is;" in that it sanctifies every relation, and chastens the heart, so that it may not wrap itself in a mantle, and indulge the mere egotism of grief. In all this world of discipline, there is no spectacle more pleasing than a heart which preserves its freshness in the midst of adversity, and in a succulent old age exhibits the enthusiasm which in youth gave out its light and heat at every social contact.

Another moral element entering into conversation is, *habitual self-control.* We use this term in its broadest sense, as meaning more than simple command of temper—but rather the complete mastery of self, in all the forms of its manifestation. The ebullition of spleen under opposition is utterly inconsistent with that refinement of feeling which respects the rights of others as equal to our own; and can scarcely escape from those who have long been under the restraints of social discipline. But there are other obstructions to free intercourse, all having their root in a self-love which needs to be controlled, if it can not be eradicated. There is, for example, your *dogmatist*, who hurls his oracular decisions at your head, and brains you outright with his positiveness. What interchange of thought can there be with one who sits cross-legged, like a Turkish bashaw, and strangles conversation in its birth? There is, again,

your *shallow skeptic*, whose minute criticism will pick to shreds the entire system of human beliefs; and whose eye can see nothing in all the glories of the sun, save the spots to censure upon his disc. His overweening vanity would plunge the world in universal doubt, that in the wild chaos of opinions he may be safe from the risk of being ever detected in error. Where nothing is established as true, nothing can be proved as false. Plainly, there can be no conversation with one who constructs nothing by affirmation, but destroys every thing by universal negation. Then follows your *disputatious sophist*, whose only style of conversation is

> "The duel in the form of a debate;"

where nothing is heard but

> "The clash of argument and jar of words,
> Worse than the mortal brunt of rival swords."

Surely, we may recoil from these prize-fighters of the social ring, and scorn the Trojan combat, in which

> "Daros may beat Entellus black and blue."

After these, you will find the *self-sufficient egotist*, who, pleased with the endless clatter of his own tongue, usurps the rights of others, and pours forth his stream of speech like water through the broken sluices of a mill-dam. Last of all, this succession of social pests concludes with the *satirical wit*, whose speech, like the Indian's arrow, is always pointed with poison. His wit must circulate, though every stroke of the keen blade cut through some heart; and no feelings are too sacred to restrain the biting jest or scorching repartee. His selfish vanity finds its reward in the laughter resounding to his satire, though it be at the price of bleeding hearts and ruined friendships. These obstructions to social intercourse have their root alike in that inordinate self-love, which leads the moralist to press this canon of conversation: it must be conducted

with a rigid self-control, locking up our vanity from every unseemly exhibition.

Lest we become tedious, we add *true moral courage* as the last pre-requisite to conversation. This preserves intact our individuality, which is placed continually beneath an immense social pressure. The honest convictions, which have been matured through long reflection, are not to be surrendered through a weak complaisance; nor must a single shred of truth be sacrificed to the devouring Moloch of public opinion. Especially is this quality necessary to woman, if she would reign as queen of the social state. We have often boiled with righteous indignation, upon seeing a high-spirited and gifted woman compelled to lower her crest, and succumb beneath the rude charge of pedantry. Her kindling spirit droops; the fire fades from her sparkling eye; and her graceful colloquial powers suddenly collapse, that she may escape the brutal and cowardly stigma of a *bas bleu.* The sensitiveness which shrinks from the offensive epithet, is honorable to her. It is the true womanly instinct which recognizes her power and her glory, as lying in her subordination; and teaches that to flaunt forth, in an assumed superiority, is to abdicate her influence. The violet is her chosen symbol, hiding its modest head beneath its tuft of leaves, yet not restraining its perfume from scenting the air, and so she waits for some friendly hand to pluck her from concealment. It requires no little nerve, combined with exquisite tact, to force down the vile aspersion, and hold her place against ruffian and brow-beating ignorance. Let her, however, remember that the same interval which separates the scholar from the pedant, also divides the woman of genuine culture from the *bas bleu.* The scholar needs not to sow his speech with ostentatious patches of learning, with which the pedant bespangles his, like the dress of a circus clown: so the absence of affectation and cant will always vindicate a woman of generous cultivation from the

offensive charge she so much dreads. Let her remember, too, this vulgar taunt never drops from the lips of her intellectual equals; but the painful echo falls upon her ear from that outer circle of the cowardly and ignorant, who can find no darkness for their concealment, save in the extinguishment of her light. If she be called to sacrifice the one or the other, let her choose wisely between the good opinion of fools, which must be gained through unworthy concessions, and the admiration of wise men, who will touch her hand with reverence, only to conduct her to the throne on which she has the right to sit.

We will gather up these scattered thoughts, and knot them in a single conclusion. It may be well submitted to the educated minds of our country, how far it devolves upon them to elevate the tone of our social intercourse. There is, undoubtedly, a large amount of genial society, where our people meet informally, and without pre-concert. But in our large assemblies, which are meant to give more full expression of the social principle, how languid and dreary the intercourse! These entertainments, unlike the graceful *soirées* of the French, or even the extemporaneous reunions of the educated English, degenerate, for the most part, into so many measured yards of brocade and silk duly crushed in a regular jam—into so many jewels, glittering upon so many heaving bosoms—a vulgar display of fashion and parade, inviting the sharp irony of Goldsmith's Chinese Philosopher, in his "Citizen of the World." Who has not yawned, again and again, beneath the insipidities of what, with a kind of broad burlesque, is called "the best society?" How much, too, of that levity, against which the Church in vain thunders her anathemas, is due to the fact that the crowd lacks amusement, and does not know how to talk? The problem is, how a dozen score of stupid people can amuse each other through five or six hours: a sufficiently hard requisition, if all of them were wise; but with those whose brains have all slipped down to

heel, what resource is there but to fill the weary hours with the unmeaning dance—and THIS IS SOCIETY! We do not speak here as churchmen, but as members of that great family, in which all are bound together; we utter a protest against abuses which destroy even the conception of society. To us, the term suggests a rational interchange of thought, "the feast of reason and the flow of soul;" and the prevailing frivolity of our social assemblies shuts out the communion of intellect—a confession by judgment of mental bankruptcy and poverty. But the evil can not be cured, until rational and pleasing conversation shall be the charm of every circle, and hence the responsibility resting upon us to lift the intellectual tone of society to the desired level.

ARTICLE IV.

TIMOTHY'S OFFICE.

There are few characters in the New Testament that dwell in the heart of the Church with a more affectionate interest than Timothy. His early piety, upon which the aged Apostle seemed to dwell with such deep delight in the last days of his life; his hereditary blessing, that descended in covenant transmission from his grand-mother, Lois, and his mother, Eunice; his filial relation to Paul, who can hardly speak of him without a gush of fatherly tenderness, and his own gentle and beautiful spirit, make him the Melancthon of apostolic men, and shrine him in the most loving remembrance of the whole Church. The very scantiness of the materials left to us about his personal history, combined with the occasional glimpses of it

given in connexion with that of the great Apostle, tends to deepen the charm with which he is invested, rather than to lessen it.

But our interest in him is not purely personal. A still deeper interest invests him in his ecclesiastical and official character. He and Titus are two of the most important links that bind the Apostolic with the post-Apostolic Church, and in their official position are involved some of the most important questions of Church polity. They mark the transition epoch of the New Testament Church, and belong to a condition of ecclesiastical affairs that was steadily assuming what was designed by the great Head of the Church to be her permanent form. If, then, we can obtain a clear conception of their official character, we shall have reached important conclusions in regard to the true form of the Church's polity, in the New Testament dispensation.

We propose, therefore, to take the case of Timothy, and inquire into the nature of the office which he held—an office which is commonly regarded as identical with that of Titus—and thus gather some light on the questions of Church government that are involved in this matter.

There are two passages of Paul's Epistles to Timothy that seem to refer to his office. The first is, 1 Tim. 4:14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;" the second is, 2 Tim. 1:6: "Wherefore, I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Assuming, for the present, that these texts do describe the office of Timothy, we will examine some of the theories of that office that have found the most strenuous advocacy. Three of them are most prominent.

I. The Apostolic Theory.

It is contended by some that Timothy was an Apostle. Conceding, as they are compelled to do, that the New Testament Episcopos and Presbyter are only different names for the same office—or, at most, different and interchangeable offices of the same order—they find their warrant for a third and higher order of Ministers in the continuance of the apostolic office in the Church, and in an unbroken series of successors to the Apostles, of which Timothy was one of the first, if not the very first, ordained to this high function. It is plain that this question resolves itself into the inquiry, whether the apostolate was designed to be a permanent office in the Church, like the presbyterate, and the diaconate, or extraordinary and temporary, like the prophetic and priestly offices.

Let us grasp the precise question at issue. It is not, whether any one in the New Testament is ever called an Apostle, except the Twelve. The word, in its primary sense, means a messenger, or one sent, and is some times used in that sense. Such a primary sense have all the official terms of the New Testament, such as bishop (an overseer); pastor (a shepherd); prophet (an internuncius); angel (a messenger); elder (an old man); deacon (a servant), etc., etc. As the designation of any one by these terms, used in their primary sense, would not argue an official position, so the calling of any one an apostolos, or messenger, does not prove him to have been officially an Apostle. The question, further, is not, whether the Apostles have successors, in any sense, for they were preaching Presbyters, as well as Apostles. Paul, Peter, and John, thus designate themselves, and in this capacity they were to have successors to the end of the world, and do have them, in every regular preacher of the true Gospel. The question is, whether, as Apostles, as the supreme rulers of the Church, their office was permanent, and whether, in

this character, Timothy, or any other man, can be a legitimate successor of the Twelve? We take the negative of this question, for several reasons.

1. *The Qualifications of an Apostle.*

Dr. Barrow, one of the profoundest theologians that has ever been produced by the Church of England, specifies six qualifications of an Apostle:*

a. An immediate call of God.—(Gal. 1 : 1.) Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by men, (διὰ, with the genitive, which is always *by means of*,) but by (διὰ) Jesus Christ, and God the Father.

b. To have seen Christ, after his resurrection, so as to be a witness of this fundamental fact. So Peter affirmed in the election of Matthias (Acts 1 : 21, 22): "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us, all the time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection;" so Ananias expressly declared to Paul (Acts 22 : 14, 15): "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of His mouth, for thou shalt be His witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard;" and so Paul affirms, himself, when, vindicating his official rank, he makes the two synonymous (1 Cor. 9 : 1): "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Christ?"

c. Miraculous powers, called by Paul (2 Cor. 12 : 12) "the signs of an Apostle."

d. Power to confer the Holy Ghost, as was implied in the case of Peter and John.—(Acts 8 : 18.)

e. Infallibility and inspiration, so that they could say, "it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," and so that all apostolic teaching was authoritative and inspired.—(Matt. 28 : 19, 20.)

---

* Treat. Pope's Suprem., Sup. 2, § 4.

f. The right to govern all Christian Churches in the world, without any limitation of parish or diocese, called by Paul (2 Cor. 10 : 8) "the authority which the Lord hath given us for edification;" "the care of all the Churches," (2 Cor. 11 : 28), and similar expressions.

These are unquestionably the scriptural qualifications of an Apostle; and as these were not, and could not be, permanent, the office to which they belonged could not be permanent.

2. *The absence of any intimation in the New Testament of the permanence of the apostolate.*

The twelve Apostles are always spoken of as a definite body of men, numbered after the twelve tribes of Israel, and just as incapable of increase as they were. Had other Apostles been added, the original number, twelve, would soon have disappeared, and been lost in the general body of Apostles, just as the original seven Deacons were at last lost in the general body of Deacons. But, instead of this, they are spoken of by Paul as the Twelve, when there were only eleven (1 Cor. 15 : 5); and by Jude (v. 17), and Peter (2 Pet. 3 : 2), in terms that imply a definite body of men, authoritative in their words, who were then nearly all gone. John, in the Apocalypse, speaks of them in the same way, and at a time when there ought to have been many Apostles, if the order was to be permanent, speaks of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.—(Rev. 21 : 14.) Nor is the case of Paul an exception to these views, for he speaks of himself as the least, *i. e.*, the last, of the Apostles. He could be least in no other sense than in the order of time, for in rank he was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles." He tells us he was "as one born out of due time," *i. e.*, almost too late to be an Apostle, so that Christ had to appear to him miraculously, in order to give him the necessary qualifications; language utterly inexplicable if there was to be an order of Apostles in regular succession through all time.

In the absence, then, of all intimations that the office was to be permanent, we are warranted to infer that it was not designed to be permanent.

3. *The absence of all instruction as to the office, or its future occupants.*

Had it been designed that the apostolate should be permanent, instructions would, surely, have been left in regard to its duties and qualifications. How, otherwise, could the Church have known whom to select, or whether they discharged their duties. Ample instructions are given as to Presbyters and Deacons, the acknowledged permanent offices. Why not as to Apostles, if they, also, were to be permanent? If directions were needed as to the lowest offices, were they not much more needed as to the highest? If a class of men in our country were to claim that they were peers of the realm, would not this claim be destroyed by the absence of all reference to this order in our laws? If, then, the New Testament is equally silent about an apostolic order, its duties, rights, qualifications, or limitations, whilst it is not silent as to the other permanent officers of the Church, the inference is irresistible that such an order was not designed to be a permanent office in the Church.

4. *The disappearance of the very name with the death of the original twelve.*

Two of the primitive offices have been perpetuated under their divinely appointed names, and the primitive Presbyters, or Bishops, and Deacons, have been succeeded by other Presbyters, or Bishops, and other Deacons, down to the present day. If the original Apostles were to be succeeded by other Apostles, why did not the name succeed with them? If they ordained men to be Apostles, why did they not call them Apostles? When Bishops, in the second and third century, began to claim authority over Presbyters, why did they still call themselves Bishops, and never Apostles? And when Bishops now claim to be the only

legitimate successors of the Apostles, why do they never call themselves Apostles? If they have a right to the thing, have they not, also, a right to the name? If they dare to claim the one, why do they not dare to claim the other? Is not every other office perpetuated by its name? Could the office be transmitted, and the name dropped? Were the Apostles so negligent, or their successors so self-renouncing and unambitions, that the one failed to transmit the name, and the other to claim it?

If the apostolic order had been perpetuated, the number of Apostles would have increased with the increase of the Church, and we would have found a proportionate increase in the mention of the name. But the reverse of this is the fact. The name is often mentioned during the lives of the twelve and Paul, and ceases to be mentioned with their death, implying that the office, also, ceased with them.

That this disappearance of the name, Apostle, did not arise from any indisposition to claim it, is proved by a fact which comes out just before the death of the last Apostle. In writing to the Church of Ephesus (Rev. 2:2,) the Lord commends them in these words: "Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." This proves, (1,) that men claimed to be Apostles, and claimed the name, as well as the power; (2,) that there were certain acknowledged qualifications by which an Apostle could be known; and, (3,) that it was the duty of the Church to try all claimants by these marks. Couple these facts with the others, that, in spite of these claims, the very name of Apostle dropped out of the vocabulary of the Church, and, in spite of this duty, no rule was left on record by which the Church, in after ages, was to recognize the true Apostle, and we have reached almost a demonstration that the order of Apostles was not designed to be, and was not, in fact, a permanent order in the Christian Church.

5. *The Case of Timothy himself.*

It is conceded that, if there were any successors to the twelve Apostles, Timothy was one of them. It is equally clear that, if so, he was the peer of all the other Apostles, Paul not excepted. But it is just as clear that Paul never does treat him as an equal, or call him an Apostle. He is sent by Paul on various missions, and required to return and report to him, as the inferior reports to the superior officer; is instructed and directed in the two Epistles to him as a superior instructs an inferior; and, when named in connexion with Paul, the greatest care is apparently taken not to give him the name of Apostle; whilst Paul, as carefully, gives this name to himself. We never read of Timothy the Apostle, but "the work-fellow."—(Rom. 16:21.) The phraseology is: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, and Timothy, our brother," (2 Cor. 1:1); "Timotheus our brother, and Minister of God, and fellow-laborer in the Gospel of Christ," (1 Thess. 3:2); "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ—unto Timothy, my own son in the faith," (1 Tim. 1:1); "My dearly beloved son," (2 Tim. 1:2); "Our brother Timothy," (Heb. 13:23); and this carefully worded phraseology, withholding the title from Timothy, is used in the very Epistles in which are found the only pretended ground for asserting the apostleship of Timothy. This marked omission is a most decisive fact, for had Timothy been an Apostle, would not Paul have said so? Was Paul a man to withhold the title and authority of his peer in office, when he so carefully affirmed his own, and when that peer was his beloved Timothy? This careful omission, and these repeated indications of an official inferiority, show conclusively that Timothy was not an Apostle, and if he was not, the chain of succession is hopelessly broken at the very first link, and the apostolate proved to be a temporary office in the Church, and not a permanent order of the ministry.

6. *The testimony of facts.*

If the twelve Apostles were now on earth, with all their apostolic authority, it is plain that no Church could reject them without the deepest guilt. To reject them, by Christ's own warrant and words, would be to reject Christ, and to forfeit all right to that blessing which he has promised, to the end of the world. Now, if the apostolate be permanent, these modern Apostles have exactly the same authority with the ancient, and they do so claim, in point of fact, and to reject them, is to incur precisely this guilt. Then we have the marvellous fact, that nine-tenths of the Protestant world have been living for generations in this great sin, and yet, that God has been blessing them in it, pouring out His Spirit upon them, and granting them the proofs of His presence, just as if they were not guilty of any such contumacy.

Is this credible? Has God ever before so blessed sin? Do men gather grapes from thorns? Do the fruits of the Spirit grow schism and contumacy? Does not this, then, amount to almost the hand-writing of God in condemnation of this aspiring assumption of the high office bestowed alone on the Twelve, and that illustrious man who closed the college, as the great Apostle to the Gentiles?

Were a further argument needed, it would be found in the utter impossibility of substantiating the apostolic succession, if it was ever designed to transmit it. The theory demands an unbroken series of successors from the Apostles to the present day—a demand which can never be met—so the theory falls by its own weight, and the entire absence of facts to support it. Macaulay presents this difficulty with so much force that we quote a few sentences from his utter demolition of it in reviewing Gladstone's Church and State. He remarks, that the evidence for the fact of apostolical succession depends on the question whether, during fifteen or sixteen hundred years, the history of which is involved in utter darkness, "some thou-

sands of events took place, any one of which may, without any gross improbability, be supposed to have taken place—whether, under King Ethelwolf, a stupid priest might not, whilst baptizing several scores of Danish prisoners, who had just made their option between the font and the gallows, inadvertently omit to perform the rite on one of these graceless proselytes?—whether, in the seventh century, an impostor, who had never received consecration, might not have passed himself off as a bishop, on a rude tribe of Scots?—whether a lad of twelve did really, by a ceremony, huddled over when he was too drunk to know what he was about, convey the episcopal character to a lad of ten?—every such case makes a break in the apostolic succession." The simple truth is, that it would be just as easy for the ambitious ruler of any petty German duchy to trace his pedigree by lineal descent to the twelve Cæsars, as for any clergyman to trace his episcopal pedigree in lineal succession from the twelve Apostles. The theory which demands this impossibility must, therefore, be rejected, by the stern necessity of facts, as untenable, and, therefore, untrue.

In view of such facts as these, the great mass of the Protestant world would have always rejected, and do now reject, this claim of apostolical succession. Down to the time of Laud, it was hardly heard of outside of Popery, and, in the earlier controversial works, is treated as a Romish tenet. Indeed, it is rejected by some of the most learned Romanists, such as the illustrious Belarmine, who restrict the succession to the Pope, and thus endeavour to establish his infallibility. This is the only consistent form in which it can be held, for an Apostle must be infallible in his official character and teachings.

Since the time of Laud, and down to the present hour, some of the most learned, pious and able men in the Church of England, have rejected it, as leading logically to Popery. Among these, are such great names as Arch-

bishops Whately and Potter, Bishops Pearson, Hoadly, Fell, and Davenant, besides Barrow, Whitley, Willet, Hooker, Chillingworth, Hinds, Lightfoot, Brett, Stillingfleet, Hammond, and others, whose names may be found in Dr. Smythe's learned and able lectures on apostolical succession, and works of a similar tenor. The Christian Observer, the organ of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, says of this doctrine of apostolical succession, that "it is a theory which is not only destitute of all scriptural basis, but it is in reality pregnant with consequences that fall nothing short of the worst abuses of Papal despotism." Testimonies just as decisive might be given, from such distinguished modern names in the English Church as Riddle, Stanley, Powell, Jowett, Litton, and others, who have carefully studied and written on this subject, and from whom nothing could have extorted a condemnation of this doctrine but its utter want of any foundation in Scripture, or right reason. We are, therefore, only standing with the greatest thinkers of the Church of England, when we reject this doctrine of the permanence of the apostolic office in the Church, and affirm that the Twelve had not, and were not designed to have, any successors in their apostolic character. This being true, it follows that neither Timothy, Titus, nor any other man, out of the number of the Twelve and Paul, were Apostles, and hence that, whatever Timothy's office might be, at least, it was not that of an Apostle.

II. The Prelatic Theory.

Some contend that Timothy was a Prelate, and Bishop of Ephesus.

This position is untenable, for some of the same reasons alleged against the first, arising from the general argument on the subject of parity in the ministry. All considerations tending to show that there were no Prelates, in the modern sense of the term, in the primitive Church, would

prove that Timothy was not a Prelate. It is useless, however, to give the argument so wide a range, as there are circumstances peculiar to the case of Timothy, which prove the position with sufficient clearness.

1. *He was ordained by a Presbytery.*

It is conceded that a lower office can not confer a higher, and hence a Presbytery can only ordain a Presbyter. If, then, Timothy was so ordained to the office which he held when the two Epistles bearing his name were written, he was a simple Presbyter, and not a Prelate, for the stream can not rise higher than its source.

The two passages already quoted as bearing on this point (1 Tim. 4 : 14, and 2 Tim. 1 : 6), seem to settle this matter beyond all doubt, for it is positively stated that the gift in question was bestowed by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, in the first; and in the second, it is further explained that Paul was probably the presiding member of that Presbytery, as he speaks of the gift as conferred by the laying on of his hands. There is no discrepancy in these statements, if they refer to the same transaction, for it is just as true of each individual in an ordaining Presbytery, and especially of the presiding officer, that the gift is bestowed by the laying on of his hands, as it is true of the whole Presbytery, and such language is frequently used, without implying that the speaker alone performed the ordaining act.

The transaction referred to in 1 Tim. 4 : 14, was an ordination, for it was the bestowal of some official gift connected with the service of the Church, and not a mere private charism. This is evident from the immediate context, which refers to his official teaching, both before and after the verse (vs. 13–16), in such a way as to show that "the gift" was an official designation to this special work. If it was not an ordination, of course, the parallel passage (2 Tim. 1 : 6) does not refer to an ordination, and as Acts 13 : 1–3 was only a consecration to a particular service, we have no

instance of an ordination in the New Testament, and no scriptural warrant at all for doing it by laying on hands. This is a conclusion to which few will be willing to come.

It was, also, an ordination by a Presbytery. As this fact determines the official rank of Timothy, some efforts have been made to evade it, which deserve a passing notice.

It is said that the Presbytery may have been composed of Apostles alone. But the record does not say so; and, as Timothy was probably ordained in Asia Minor, at a distance from nearly all the Apostles, the supposition is unlikely. But, even if it were true, it would bear very strongly the other way, for it would show that they ordained, not as Apostles, but as Presbyters, which they were, by the statement of Peter and John (1 Pet. 5 : 1, and 2 John 1). But, by every analogy of language, a Presbytery must be a body of Presbyters, and nothing else, and if it confers an office, it must be the office of a Presbyter, and nothing higher.

Others say that the word Presbytery, means the office of Presbyter; but it never has that meaning, and would, moreover, involve a contradiction, for how could an office lay on hands?

Others say that the preposition, μετα, only expresses the concurrence of the Presbytery in the ordaining act, and not that it performed the act itself. But when was mere concurrence expressed by the laying on of hands? If the laying on of Paul's hands meant ordination, how could it mean less in the Presbytery? And why do we never afterwards hear of this concurrence, but always find the laying on of hands to mean ordination?

The preposition, μετα, may be taken either causally or connectively. If the first, it declares that the gift was bestowed by prophecy, through the instrumentality of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. If the second, that it was bestowed by prophecy, together with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. As far as the point in question is concerned, it matters not which sense is taken,

for in both cases the Presbytery performed an essential and official part in the ordination. The second sense, however, is the true one.* The plain meaning is, that Timothy was called to the ministry in two ways; first, by an extraordinary call, the prophecies that went before him, and, perhaps, a direct utterance of some prophetic person, endowed with this New Testament gift; and, secondly, by the ordinary call, expressed by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. There was, therefore, in his case, precisely the same elements that are found in the case of every other true Minister of Christ, a divine and a human call. In his case the divine call was by the Holy Spirit, speaking through prophetic men, in an extraordinary manner; in other cases, it is by the same Spirit, speaking in the written Word, and on the heart of the candidate, but in both, amounting to the very same thing, *i. e.*, the expression of God's will. In the human call, the agency is the same, the endorsement by the living Church of the validity of this divine call, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Hence, we can in no way escape the conclusion that the office which Timothy held when this Epistle was written was bestowed on him, as to its human medium, by a Presbytery, and as a Presbytery could only ordain a Presbyter, Timothy was only a Presbyter, and not a Prelate.

2. *Facts are against this theory.*

It is said that he was Bishop of Ephesus, because Paul exhorted him to abide at Ephesus, for a special reason assigned. But, if so, why beseech him to abide at the place of his abode, and where it was his duty to abide? Does not this request of Paul prove the very reverse, and show that Ephesus was not his place of abode, and hence that he was not its Prelate?

But we have a fact that is decisive of this point. After the date of this Epistle, Paul met the Elders of Ephesus at

* See Winer's Grammar, Part III., § 47, etc.

Miletum, and gave them his final charge. If Timothy was ever the Bishop of Ephesus, it was then; and we have a right to expect some allusion to it in Paul's charge to the Elders. Is there a shadow of allusion to any such thing? Why does he not refer to their Bishop, and urge them to obey him as their lawful Prelate? Was he a man to weaken the hands of legitimate authority, and that the authority of his beloved Timothy? Had this "beloved son" been their Bishop, would he not have commended him to them, and urged them to honor and submit to him? But what was his exhortation? "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers (bishops)," thus calling them Bishops of the Church, and giving no sort of allusion to Timothy, or any other prelatic Bishop then existing, or likely thereafter to exist, in the Church of Ephesus. Does not this silence prove that there was no such officer there, and that, therefore, Timothy was not the Bishop of Ephesus? But if he was not then, he was not at all, for Paul died soon after this, as he intimated in his farewell address; and all the alleged evidence of the prelatic character of Timothy is admitted to be of a date earlier than this interview.

If an attempt were made to fix a later date than this, it would be met by the uniform tradition of the Church, that John spent the last thirty years of his life in Ephesus, a fact which makes any prelatic position of Timothy in Ephesus unnecessary, if not impossible; for either John was under the diocesan control of Timothy, which was incompatible with his apostolic character; or Timothy was under the apostolic control of John, which was incompatible with his prelatic character. In any event, the inference is plain, that Timothy was not a Prelate, and that this was not the office to which he was ordained by the Presbytery; and we are forced to the conclusion, which Archdeacon Stanley has announced in his able Sermons and Essays on the apostolic age, (p. 78): "That we can not

anticipate half a century by calling Timotheus the Bishop of Ephesus, or by elevating that venerable name, as it occurs in the pages of the New Testament, to the single dignity which it has since acquired."

Some of these considerations are equally applicable to the case of Titus, in which there is the additional difficulty, that if he were the prelatic Bishop of the island of Crete, whilst Timothy would only have had the oversight of one city, Titus would have had that of nearly one hundred cities, making not only an inexplicable disproportion in their diocesan bounds, but a charge so extended as to make it almost impossible to perform its duties efficiently. We are, therefore, warranted in the inference, that in neither case was the office held by them that of a Prelate.

III. THE TRUE THEORY.

The real work of Timothy is explained by Paul in 2 Tim. 4 : 5: "Do the work of an Evangelist; make full proof of thy ministry." As to his ecclesiastical order, he was a Presbyter; as to his special work, he was an Evangelist.

That the Evangelist was one of the officers in the primitive Church, appears from Eph. 4 : 11: "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers"; from the case of Philip, who is called "the Evangelist," (Acts 21 : 8), and from the case of Timothy, and, we may add, of Titus—for, although not called by the name, his work is clearly that of an Evangelist. To this class, also, belonged Silas, Luke, John, Mark, Epaphras, Epaphroditus, Tychichus, Trophimus, Demas, Apollos, and other co-laborers of Paul.

Calvin says (Inst. IV., ch. III., § 4): "By 'Evangelists,' I understand those who were inferior to the Apostles in dignity, but next to them in office, and who performed similar functions. Such were Luke, Timothy, Titus, and others of

that description, and, perhaps, also, the seventy Disciples, whom Christ ordained to occupy the second station of the Apostles." Stillingfleet says (Irenicum, chap. VI., § 19): "Evangelists were those who were sent some times into this country to put the churches in order there, some times into another, but wherever they were, they acted as Evangelists, and not as fixed officers. And such were Timothy and Titus, notwithstanding all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any one that will take an impartial survey of the arguments on both sides."

That these Evangelists were not confined to the apostolic age, as some allege, we learn from Eusebius, who, in writing about the second century,* says that there were then many Evangelists, who performed this work "to those who had not yet heard the faith, whilst, with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the Holy Gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and coöperation of God. The Holy Spirit, also, wrought many wonders as yet through them, so that as soon as the Gospel was heard, men voluntarily, in crowds, and eagerly, embraced the true faith." And, speaking afterwards of Pantænus, the philosopher, who flourished about A. D. 180, he says, that he went as a preacher to India, and that "there were even there yet many Evangelists of the Word, who were ardently striving to employ their inspired zeal after the apostolic example. Of these Pantænus is said to have been one." †

Such was the work to which Timothy was called, and in which we have reason to believe he spent his life. In the tenderness of his youth, he left his native home, among the

* Eccl. Hist., Lib. III., ch. 37.

† Lib. V., chap. 10.

hills of Lycaonia, traversed with Paul much of Asia Minor, crossed into Europe, and travelled as far as Corinth. We then find him making long tours under the direction of Paul. Now, visiting Ephesus to organize the Church more fully, and rebuke errorists; now, sent to Macedonia on a special mission; now, accompanying Paul in his last visit to Jerusalem; now, sharing his confinement at Rome, or visiting the Churches to report on their condition; now, liberated from prison, and starting on a new tour; and, finally, commissioned at last by the aged Apostle to bring his cloak, to shield him from the chilly damp of a Roman prison, and give him a final look at his books and parchments. Such, then, was Timothy's work, partly an apostolic work, as far as itinerating to preach and establish discipline was concerned, without an apostolic rank and responsibility; and partly a work that was suggested and determined by the ever-varying circumstances of the Church. But it is plain that, as long as the Church had missionary work to do, either in occupying new fields, or maturing the culture of old ones, so long she needed the labours of Evangelists, and so long, we have reason to believe, she enjoyed them. The office of Timothy, then, was a most important one in the primitive Church, and one to which, as the testimony of Eusebius proves, she owed much of her great success.

A question of no small interest arises here, whether this office was intended to be permanent? Many distinguished theologians affirm that it was not, but, like that of Apostle and Prophet, was temporary, and no longer exists. It is true that, in the precise form in which it existed in the primitive Church, it does not any longer exist, for the same facts that created the necessity for the apostolic office, gave a peculiar and temporary form to that of Evangelist. But as to its essential functions, there is nothing in them to make it temporary, but rather the contrary.

There are two great functions of the Church, the progressive and conservative; by the one of which she extends her labors into new territories, by the other, cultivates the ground already occupied. The second is met by the pastoral office; the first can only be reached by that of the Evangelist. Hence, whenever the foreign missionary work has been undertaken, this office has been, of necessity, used, as the foreign Missionary is an Evangelist. Now, as this is a perpetual work of the Church, it would seem to follow that the office by which alone it can be performed, must be a perpetual office.

But in the home-work, particularly in a country situated like ours, there are facts that seem to demand the continuance of this office. There is a vast amount of work to be done in every denomination of the Christian Church, that can not be overtaken by the settled pastorate. The system of colportage is a confession of this need, and an effort to meet it, which can have only a limited success, as it is not the divinely appointed method of meeting it. Different branches of the Church have attempted to meet it in different ways. The Methodist Church has met it most fully, because its whole system is one of Evangelists, from the itinerant circuit-rider up to the itinerant Bishop, who is only a Presbyter in rank, though an Evangelist in function, with very extensive powers. The splendid success of this Church as an aggressive system shows the value of this arm of the service, and, had the founder of this system not overlooked the conservative work of the Church, which can only be performed by a settled pastorate, its success would have been proportionably greater. The Episcopal Church has met this necessity, in some of its aspects, by her order of Bishops, who are simply Evangelists, with the sole power of ordination, and large powers of government. Much of the success of this Church, so far as it is due to the activity of her Bishops, is owing to this evangelistic feature, that she selects her best men, and sends them forth clothed with

honor and power, to do the work of an Evangelist. Where no exclusive claims are arrogated for these modes of meeting this want, we have no controversy with those who prefer them, but wish them God speed in every sincere attempt to evangelize the world. But we believe that the scriptural mode of meeting it is equally efficacious, more simple, and less liable to abuses than any other, and that is by the primitive, and, as we believe, permanent office of an Evangelist.

There has been a prejudice felt in our own Church against this office, since the abuses of it during the great revival season of 1830, when Evangelists were guilty of great extravagances, unsettling pastors, dividing Churches, relying on mere human machinery for getting up excitements that scarred over many regions with scars of burning that still remain, and brought the very name of Evangelist into contempt. This prejudice has had much to do with its comparative disuse. We have committed the great error of undervaluing the office, and so degrading it in the estimate of the Church, that a man who was fit for no other place has generally been the one thought of for the work of an Evangelist. Men of superior talent and piety have been sought for, as occupants of important pastoral charges and professorships, whilst any one, it was thought, would do for an Evangelist. We have thus dishonored the office, and lowered it from its scriptural place, and suffered in consequence of this depreciation. It ought to have been an office to which the finest talents of the Church would have felt it an honor to be summoned, as much so as an election to the Episcopate in either of the Churches which have adopted that system. It ought to have an honor, perhaps, higher than the pastorate, for so it seems to have been placed by Christ, and to have been considered in the primitive Church. It is placed in rank only below Apostles and Prophets, and above pastors and teachers, in Eph. 4 : 11; and we have no doubt that its occupants, when they worthily

filled their office, were regarded with a reverence, corresponding to this divine order.

It is a well known fact that this feature was engrafted, in precisely this form, on the Church of Scotland, in the beginning of the Reformation, by the appointment of Superintendent. Scotland was divided into ten districts, to each of which it was designed to appoint a Superintendent, whose residence, duties and stipend, were all fixed by law. Three sections in the First Book of Discipline are devoted to these Superintendents, from which it is plain that their functions were precisely those of the New Testament Evangelist. In giving reasons for making this distinction between ministers, and appointing a larger stipend to the Superintendents, it is stated, "we have thought it a thing most expedient at this time that, from the whole number of godly and learned men, now presently in this realm, be selected ten or twelve, (for in so many provinces have we divided the whole), to whom charge and commandment should be given, to plant and erect kirks, to set, order, and appoint ministers, as the former order prescribes, to the countries that shall be appointed to their care, where none are now." It needs but a glance at the duties, limitations and qualifications of these Superintendents, to show that they differ most essentially from Anglican Bishops—(Calderwood makes out thirteen heads of difference)—and that they were simply Evangelists.

It was found difficult to obtain suitable men for these positions, and their places were supplied by visitors appointed by the General Assembly; and, as the Church became settled and supplied with qualified ministers, they were gradually disused, so that in the Second Book of Discipline, adopted eighteen years after the First, all allusion to them is omitted. They may have been thought to savor too much of prelacy, for the intense Presbyterianism of Scotland—but it is a matter for curious speculation—what

would have been the effect of perpetuating this feature in the Scottish Church.

Whatever may have been true of Scotland, with its limited territory, densely peopled, and fully supplied with ministerial labour, we can not but think that this system, or some thing like it, would have worked well in this country, with its boundless field, its sparse population, and its very limited supply of ministers. Suppose that each large Presbytery, or Synod, had enjoyed the labours of such an Evangelist during our past history, or even for twenty-five years, and the results must have been great. He need not have been a Whitfield, a Nettleton, a Baker, or a Guinness, in his qualifications; but to test the theory properly, he ought to have been one of the most efficient men in the body, who devoted himself to the work, not for a year or two, but for life. What, then, would have been his work? He would, of course, have visited those regions where the Gospel had never been preached, and, gathering the people into court-houses, school-houses, log cabins, or beneath the shade of forests, told them the story of the Cross. He would have discovered, in unexpected places, solitary individuals, or families of Christians, far removed from their churches, and pining under silent Sabbaths, who might have been induced to begin a Sunday-School, which would have been the nucleus of a church. He would have left here and there a book, tract, or newspaper, which would have brought some soul to Christ; and found young men of promise, and, perhaps, of piety, to whom a little aid might have opened the way to an education, and, perhaps, to the ministry, but who, wanting this, have never emerged from their obscurity. He would have gone from plantation to plantation, and enlisted the affections of both servants and masters, so as to be a blessing to both, as well as a common bond of sympathy in the temporal relations of life. He would have visited feeble churches, and preached to them, at regular intervals, until they were

stronger, and finally led them to obtaining a permanent Pastor. He would have visited the larger churches; and, as he told them of the scenes he had witnessed, the wants and desolations of the outlying regions, and the Macedonian cry that came up from them, his statements would have had a force that those of a special agent could not have had, from his impartial knowledge of the whole field. He would have kindled a fresh zeal in these churches. His visits would often have been the occasion for a glorious revival, and he would thus have been the living bond and vehicle of aid and sympathy between the remotest churches. And, as years rolled on, and his voice and form had become familiar over a large district of country, his influence would have grown apace; his experience extended to the minutest facts in the sphere of his labour; his counsels have been invaluable in every projected missionary movement, to a Presbytery or Synod, and his efficiency increased with every year of mature labor. And then, as gray hairs and advancing age began to narrow his circle of toil, how wide and deep would have been the reverence and love which must have clustered around his person—how full his rejoicing over the ever-coming sheaves of the seed he had sown as he went forth weeping, until his mantle would have been ready to descend upon some young Timothy or Titus, who could carry yet farther and wider the work he had begun! Who can measure the influence that such a man must have had, and the work that he must have done? Must he not have carried our outposts farther in ten years than they are now carried in twenty?

And yet, precisely such a class of labourers s included in our system, at least in its theory, if not its practice, and the work that they would do is not done by any systematic agency we are using. It is the great unused arm of our service. Had we Deacons busy in caring for the temporal aspects of the churches; Elders for their spiritual condi-

tion; Pastors feeding the flock diligently; Teachers, from the Sunday-School to the Theological Seminary; and then a corps of judicious, earnest, honored Evangelists, traversing the whole territory, and gathering up every interest not compassed by other agencies, and knitting the whole together by bonds of living sympathy, who can doubt that our march would have been much more rapid, and equally sure? In two years of such labour, Daniel Baker was the means, under God, of converting twenty-five hundred souls, and the success of Nettleton is well known to every intelligent member of our Church. Dr. A. Alexander, in an article published just before his death, mentions that the first two years of his ministry were spent in such labour, and states that, in reviewing the results of the system of evangelism inaugurated at that time by the Synod of Virginia, he saw the most beneficial and permanent results. Had such work as this been spread over many years, by many hands and hearts, who can doubt that results the most precious and enduring would have been reached?

We are glad to see, within a year or two past, an awakening of fresh interest in this work, and the experiment made by several of the Southern Synods, of a regular system of evangelism. As far as we are aware, the success of these movements has fully justified their adoption; and if, in any case, it has been otherwise, the cause will be found elsewhere than in the system itself. We only ask for it a fair trial. And to secure this, the office must be raised to its primitive dignity as soon as possible. The amplest salary must be attached to it, to cover every contingency, and to give it the consideration that will always be attached to a position that has an honorable support. The best men must be elected to it, as to a place of high public trust, and the Church must then patiently wait the result of their large and systematic labours.

There has never been a time, perhaps, when this movement could be more auspiciously made than the present,

when our Southern Church is opening a new chapter in her history, assuming a new form, and girding herself to do the great work to which her Head is calling her. That work, in our wide territory, our sparse population, our paucity of ministers, and, especially, our vast masses of colored people, so difficult to reach by our ordinary agencies, can in no way be so well done, we believe, as by resorting to an extensive use of the primitive, powerful and simple agency of the New Testament Evangelist.

ARTICLE V.

THE VICTORY OF MANASSAS PLAINS.

This glorious victory appears in its true light, when we consider the months that were occupied in marshalling, disciplining, and in every way preparing for this decisive battle, "the grand army" of the North, and the combined forces of the South. To this focus, all the energies, military genius, and unlimited resources of General Scott, converged. "Over one hundred thousand troops," according to their own estimates,* were concentrated to meet, as they

* We find the following in the *New York Times*, of the 18th July:

THE ADVANCE OF THE ARMY.—The utterance of a single word by Lieutenant-General Scott has sent through the American heart a sense of satisfaction that it has not experienced since the dark day of treason dawned. That word is the monosyllable, "March." As it was borne along the lines from Arlington to Alexandria, full fifty-five thousand men leaped to their feet with delight, and prepared for the long-sought encounter with the enemy. All regrets and repinings of the past were shaken off. The memory of toilsome work in ditches, of tedious hours in drill, of days of weary waiting in camp, vanished on the instant. The tents gave up their loiterers, and the hospitals gave up their sick; for the bugle note that sounded "forward," brought the warm blood coursing through their veins as of old, and nothing could restrain their resolution to go with their stouter comrades to the field.

believed and published, not one-half that number. Ten thousand regulars, constituting the standing army of the

---

The tonic to the Nation is equally remarkable and inspiriting. We, too, forget our impatience and misgivings. We find the Government in motion: President and Cabinet, General-in-Chief, and Generals of Divisions—officers and men—artillery, cavalry, and infantry—all in motion, and leading the Nation's strength to battle. So grand a spectacle never before was presented to the world—the uprising of a peaceful people, in numbers so vast, and in armament so sudden and complete, to preserve their Government, and vindicate the principles on which it is founded.

With this demonstration of energy, the popular demand is placated; and the press, which has uttered no word of complaint but at popular instance, and has had no purpose but to make the Administration clearly understand the people's will in regard to the war, suspends all criticism, and gives, to President and Cabinet, and to the General-in-Chief of our armies, the heartiest applause and support. Let the work go on bravely, as it is now begun. The Administration and the people are abreast. Their hearts beat in unison, and in the mutual good understanding thus begotten, is a moral strength miraculous and invincible.

The popular rejoicings over the news from Washington allow no room for discussion of plans or conjectures of strategy. The army is in motion, and it advances upon the central seats of treason. That suffices. The accomplished and soldierly McDowell, the cautious Patterson, and the impetuous McClellan, heading columns that contain fully one hundred thousand soldiers of the Union, are now advancing upon Richmond. In good time, and in the pre-arranged way, they will enfold that centre of rebellion in a deadly *entourage* of rifle and cannon, and reduce its obdurate temper to the peaceful and prosperous rule of the Republic. That will emancipate Virginia, and once more unlock her closed rivers and harbors.

The *Cincinnati Times*, of the 19th July, says:

THE SITUATION.—Gen. McDowell still advances. One wing of his army has passed through Centreville, and the whole division, at last accounts, was within four miles of Manassas. In the whole advance, we have reports of but one skirmish. At Bull Run the enemy are said to have driven back our skirmishers, with a slight loss upon our side.

This is the only stand they have made. At all other points they left in a hurry, as soon as convinced that our army was approaching. From the fact that they left behind much of their camp equipage and personal baggage, we infer that the chivalrous South Carolinians proved about the fleetest of foot.

We have a story, through the *New York Herald*, that the rebels have held a military consultation, and have determined to fall back on Richmond, where immense preparations are being made for defence. We doubt the truth of the story, and are inclined to the opinion that Beauregard will show fight at Manassas.

If Beauregard makes a stand at Manassas, we shall have news of an engagement to-day. McDowell is "quick on the trigger," and will not pause in front of the enemy.

We are inclined to believe that the reporters have been deceived as to the number of Gen. McDowell's force. Instead of 50,000, we believe it must be double that number. We publish, to-day, a private letter, written by a citizen of Alexandria to his brother here, in which the number is put down at 120,000. It is enough, at all events, to take Manassas without a prolonged engagement.

United States, were among the number. Six batteries of flying artillery, the fame and prowess of which were of

---

We hear again from Gen. Patterson. Instead of moving upon Winchester, he diverged to the North, and has taken position at Charlestown. This town lies directly between Harper's Ferry and Winchester, and is noted as the place where John Brown and his associates were tried and executed.

The Federal troops are probably encamped in the very wheat-field where the executions took place, and it is not unlikely that some of the Southern chivalry, as prisoners of war, may occupy the same prison in which John Brown was confined! Johnston's position is represented to be strongly fortified on the north at Winchester, and Patterson hesitates to attack him in front. From present information, we think that Patterson will stand still until he can throw a heavy force into Johnston's rear.

This will be an easy task. With the position of the parties, Beauregard's retreat or defeat would place Johnston in a very critical position. McDowell could then turn a heavy force in his rear, by the way of Oak Hill and Strasburg, force him upon Patterson, and prevent all possibility of escape.

A correspondent of the *New York Express* said, just before the battle of Manassas Plains:

Western Virginia will, we now see, soon be cleared from the insurrectionists, and so will all that part of Virginia which borders upon the upper Potomac. When McClellan and Patterson can coöperate, Gen. Scott will *start the huge column in front of Washington "for Richmond,"* for McClellan's movements are all in his *programme.* Within five miles of me, on the Virginia side of the Potomac, are forty regiments of regular and volunteer United States troops. Pieces of artillery of every size, from the handsome bright brass howitzers to the huge black-painted columbiads, crown the hills, or lie peacefully upon the green earth along the valleys. They rest as peacefully now upon their rolling carriages as so many children in their cradles, but they are ready, and with good men behind them, to give them not only voice, but terrible utterances, whenever the word, "advance," is given.

The following in reference to the notorious Bennett, editor of the *New York Herald,* is from the *Richmond Dispatch,* a few days after the battle:

YANKEE LIES.—Sawney, of the *New York Herald,* does not stand upon trifles. He says "the rebel army actually in action at Bull Run numbered close upon 50,000 men, well officered, well entrenched, protected by masked batteries, and abundantly supplied with artillery." This is a lie out of the whole cloth. The battle was fought upon unfortified ground; there was not an entrenchment or a masked battery within miles of it. What is said of our officers is true; but all the rest is sheer falsehood. The Confederate force actually engaged never exceeded 15,000 men, as may be seen from an inspection of the muster-rolls of the regiments engaged.

"Opposed to them, (the Confederates,) was a conglomeration of badly officered regiments—with an aggregate in the field of not over 18,000 men—with no general commanding—each one fighting on his own hook, and with a totally inadequate supply of cannon," etc.

Thirty-four regiments—the very pride of the Northern soldiery—regiments which the *Herald* itself was accustomed to tell us, before the battle, were invincible, attacked our left wing. They certainly did not number less than thirty-five thousand men. One of the captured officers said they

world-wide notoriety, including sixty-five guns, and some as large as sixty-four pounders, aided by a powerful body of cavalry, made the assurance of victory doubly sure. The time, and place, and mode of attack, were determined by themselves. Their march was guided by traitors familiar with every accessible approach. General Scott and the best leaders in the army conducted this assembled host, and animated them throughout the arduous conflict. It was, however, believed that the Southern forces would not fight; or that if they did, that they would do so only behind their entrenchments, and that they would speedily fall back towards Richmond. A glorious victory or triumphal march had been heralded throughout the land. Never had such jubilant feelings—not of hope, but of expectation, nay, of present and positive triumph—exhilarated the overjoyed heart of the North. Provisions were on the field to celebrate in sumptuous banquet the restoration of a dismembered Union and the annihilation of its traitorous enemies. Fine wines and brandies were on hand in abundance. One hundred hogsheads of bacon, and numerous packages, were directed to Richmond. Our Generals, Lee and Beauregard, were to be hung in sight of the two armies. The eighteenth and twentieth of July, 1861, were, therefore, big with the fate of two confederated empires. Europe, for a time,

---

were from thirty-seven to forty thousand strong. There were, besides, nine regiments on their left, and nine in reserve: Total, fifty-two regiments of infantry, exclusive of five thousand regulars. As for their artillery, they had Sherman's battery, Carlisle's battery, Griffith's battery, the Rhode Island battery, the West Point battery, and the huge battery of rifled thirty-two-pounders, eighty-one pieces, and they lost all but two in their flight. In one word, it was the most magnificent park of artillery that ever accompanied an army to the field of battle in America.

What object can Sawney have in telling these lies? Is he afraid the mob will tear down his office, if he tell the truth, as they threatened to do with Greeley's, when he published the truth about this matter, and as they would have done had not Greeley speedily fallen back upon his old resource of falsehood?

Gen. Scott has given orders that no more official reports about the battle shall be published. He knows the slaughter was too terrible to be exposed. This fact speaks volumes.

believed that their result must have consummated the doom of the Southern, and the consolidation, as a military despotism, of the Northern Confederacy; that as thus far—by their report—their fortune had kept an onward course, so now they were graced with wreaths of victory.*

Now, that in such circumstances, against such an overwhelming force, one-half of our army of thirty thousand volunteers, many of whom were delicately reared, pro-

---

* MAKING NEWS FOR FOREIGN EFFECT.—The *New York Herald*, of the 20th July, gives a striking illustration of the diligent mendacity of the Northern press which was employed in making up accounts for Europe. The *Herald* says:

The steamers which leave for Europe to-morrow will take out intelligence which will exercise no small influence on the European mind. They will take out the first accounts of the advance movement toward Richmond, and of the gradual concentration of the forces under McClellan and Patterson; of the evident unwillingness or incapacity of the rebels to stand their ground anywhere except behind walls or masked batteries; of the patriotic and vigorous action of Congress, and of the prevalence of a conviction in Wall street that the danger has passed away, and that now the entire suppression of the rebellion is merely a question of time and patience. This news will carry conviction to the European mind; as soon as it is digested, we shall receive assurances from Europe which will dispel any anxieties that may still be felt with regard to the tendency of European policy. The cotton spinners must, for their own sakes, take sides with the winners in this war. As soon as they find that the Southerners, who have bellowed so loudly about their rights, their "sacred soil," and their tremendous courage, evacuate post after post, as soon as attacked; run like sheep at sight of the Northern volunteers, and are never known to stand their ground, except when they have a stout breastwork between them and the enemy, the European public will shrewdly infer that it is not on their banners that victory will perch in this war. As soon as that inference becomes general, the danger of a collision between our naval forces at the Southern ports and foreign vessels will disappear, and an inquiry for United States securities will probably spring up, which will be felt in our markets.

The *Cincinnati Gazette*, of the 22d July, before the news of the victory could reach that place, said:

CAPTURE OF THE BATTERIES AT BULL RUN.—This strong position fell yesterday, before the spirit and courage of the national soldiers. It is probable that, encouraged by the partial repulse of our troops the day before, Beauregard sent strong reinforcements to this position. But nothing can stand before the indomitable pluck of the Northern troops. Manassas will fall into our hands, as Bull Run has. So will Richmond, and every place where the Confederates dare to make a stand. We are now realizing the difference between true courage and false, fire-eating chivalry.

fessional and sedentary men, and almost all citizens "to the manor born," of each of whom it might be said, that

> "Pride in the gift of country and of name
> Speaks in his eye and step—
> He treads his native land"—

that these, of whom a number had barely reached the field from Richmond, and, under all the oppression of fatigue and want of sleep, of food, and of water,* were immediately formed into line in the fore-front of the fiercest battle—that in such circumstances, fifteen thousand men should sustain the shock of thirty-five thousand, including ten thousand regulars, and Sherman's celebrated battery of guns, for fourteen hours; that this battery, so powerfully sustained, should be taken by a bayonet charge of a regiment of volunteers; the entire force of the enemy be thrown into consternation, confusion, and universal rout, leaving in our possession six batteries, sixty-seven cannon—all they had but two—one hundred wagons, some two thou-

---

* As an instance of the spirit animating all our troops, the *Richmond Enquirer* mentions that the Sixth North Carolina Regiment went immediately from the cars to the battle of Manassas, after eating no meal since Saturday morning. They joined in the pursuit, and were too exhausted to return to camp, but bivouacked on the field. Col. Fisher was the only officer killed.

A correspondent of the *Charleston Courier* writes from General Beauregard's headquarters:

JULY 24, 1861.—My first visit, after paying my respects to General Beauregard, who had kindly invited us to his quarters, was to the Washington Light Infantry Volunteers. I found Captain Conner and his officers all well, but the company had suffered very much. They behaved gloriously, and deserve the highest praise—they behaved like veterans. The Legion only arrived on the ground at two o'clock Sunday morning, after a most harassing trip from Richmond. They had to lay on the ground, without food or water, until daylight, when they were called up to take their place in the picture, with hardly a mouthful to eat or a drop of water, until near the commencement of the battle, when they got a little muddy water. Their position was in the left wing, by whom the battle was fought (principally); after suffering a murderous fire for some time without flinching, they charged a battery, and drove the enemy from it, and then turned it over to a Virginia artillery company to use. After this, they were too much exhausted to pursue the enemy far, the fate of the day having been decided, and the enemy in full retreat, or rather run, for when they started it was pell mell. These, also, lay all night after the battle in a corn-field, without food or drink.

sand prisoners, a stand of colours, and a star-spangled banner, and covering the gory field and their path of flight for miles with between two and five thousand dead bodies, twenty or thirty thousand stand of arms, every implement of war, and be saved only by night from immeasurable destruction; and that after six months' preparation, and world-wide prophetic boasting, they should be driven back to the positions occupied three months before—this surely is a glorious victory and a grand and immortal display of that heroic valour, "whose noble soul all fear subdues," and bravely dares the danger nature shrinks from.

> "Ah, never can this land forget
> How gushed the life blood of the brave!
> Gushed warm with hope and courage yet
> Upon the land they fought to save."

For this victory the people of the Confederate States are called upon for ever to render unto Almighty God the glory due unto His gracious and wonder-working Providence. Yet, in doing this, sincerely and satisfactorily, there is an instinct of hearts filled to overflowing with patriotic pride, which demands utterance, and which finds utterance in rapturous applause, for the virtues and the valour of all

> "The leaders brave, whose deeds and death have given
> A glory to our skies, a music to our name;"

and not less heartily for the courage of the three hundred private soldiers who died for this victory; and for the sacrifices of those one thousand or more, whose life-long scars and crippled limbs testify to their part in that bloody field; and even for the endurance of all the rest who survived uninjured, to tell, as we trust they will, to their children and children's children, the tale of the glorious victory, and all the various fortunes of that day. All this is right and proper, and no more than they deserve from the hands of

a country grateful to God for them, in being grateful to them.

> "Thus should they sleep who for their country die,
> When low and cold they lie,
> By all their country's wishes blest!
> When spring, with dewy fingers cold,
> Returns to deck their hallowed mould,
> She there shall dress a sweeter sod
> Than fancy's feet have ever trod.
> By fairy hands their knell is rung,
> By forms unseen their dirge is sung:
> There Honour comes, a pilgrim grey,
> To bless the turf that wraps their clay,
> And Freedom shall awhile repair,
> To dwell a weeping hermit there."

Nor is such praise and gratitude to men inconsistent with supreme regard to the glorious providence of God. This victory has a two-fold aspect; one, as it is human, and the result of human agency; and another, as it is divine, and is the effect of Divine wisdom and power.

Considered as human, this victory is the result of that combination of laws, material, physical, mental and moral, adapted to the present nature and condition of man, by which God governs the world, and reigns a ruler over the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of the earth. Under this complicated system of mutually adjusted laws, an innumerable combination of instrumentalities and events was necessary in order to secure this victory, and all the individual consequences connected with it.

Soldiers were necessary—true soldiers—with arm to strike and soul to dare; "whose spirit lends a fire even to the dullest peasant in the camp, and from whose metal all their party's steeled"; generous soldiers, whose pay is glory, and their best reward to die for, or live to share, their country's freedom; soldiers, whose every name

> "Shall shine untarnished on the rolls of fame,
> And stand the example of each distant age,
> And add new lustre to the historic page."

But for such soldiers officers are also requisite, of a character and capacity proportionately ennobled; leaders who can attract and attach their men, so as to discipline and direct them; whose genius can comprehensively survey, and give unity of purpose, plan, and preparation; equip, provision, and protect; instruct and intensify every patriotic impulse; combine personal dignity and sympathy with their soldiers; elevate true worth; encourage virtue, and repress all mean and dishonorable conduct; and animate, by their presence, spirit, and example,

> ——— "The brave,
> Who rush to glory and a grave."

Now, our possession of such an army, and such resources, is a just ground for exultation, for self-respect, for confidence for the future, for calm and hopeful expectation of success—nay, for the assurance of triumphant victory. Indeed, by the victories of Bethel, and Manassas, and Leesburg, and many of minor consequence—though in themselves equally important—in the various skirmishes and personal rencontres that have occurred; and even in the occasions of partial defeat, under surprisal and overwhelming numbers, the superiority of the Southern over the Northern soldiery is demonstrated. We have beheld, with thrilling rapture, our heroic men in this battle of Manassas, when overwhelmed, and by the attempt to break their firm array, form, unite, charge, waver—*all is lost!* No!

> "Within a narrow space compressed, beset,
> Hopeless, not heartless, they strive and struggle yet,—
> Hemmed in—cut off—cleft down—and trampled o'er!
> But each strikes singly, silently, and home,
> And sinks out-wearied, rather than o'ercome;
> His last faint quittance rendering with his breath,
> Till the blade glimmers in the grasp of death:
> No dread of death—if with us die our foes."

We may be sure, therefore, that, with any thing like equal advantages in number, arms, and opportunity, our South-

ern troops will overmatch those that come up against us. But, at the same time, we are taught, very forcibly, that, as defeat must be to us death and destruction, ignominy and disgrace insufferable, and a subjection to a tyranny more despotic than that of any European, or even Asiatic, *one-man* power, our only dependence is in continued and increased vigilance, unanimity, energy, voluntary service and sacrifice; the enrolment, equipment, and discipline of every man capable of bearing arms, and timely and full preparation of all the armament and appliances of war, as adapted to our sea-coasts and cities, and, above all other, preëminently, for our own beloved Charleston and South Carolina. First and foremost in the revolutionary movement, she is doomed to the direst vengeance. The war, it is said, began at Charleston, and it must end there. Charleston must be razed to the ground, and South Carolina converted into a wilderness, and sown in salt, so that no man shall ever again pass through it.

Let us, then, seek and secure the right men to guard us, and to lead us—men with whom

> "Their country first, their glory and their pride,
> Land of their hopes, and where their father's died,
> Whose home-felt pleasure prompts the patriot's sigh,
> And makes them wish to live, and dare to die."

Let all our mothers be—as many of them are—Spartan mothers; and, as they gird on their armour, and bless them for the field, let them point their brave sons to their shield, and say:

> "Come *with* it, when the battle's done,
> Or *on* it, from the field."

Let us remember our fathers, who still live with us and among us, and by their spell-binding presence still guard our beleagured land; and let us fill every mountain gorge, and luxuriant valley, and sea-girt fortress, with the echo of

tramping hosts, and the war shouts: "Onward—for God and freedom! Give us liberty, or give us death!"

Oh, yes! it is the sons of such mothers, and the worthy inheritors of such patriot sires, our young-fledged empire requires to carry her safely through that sea of fire by which she is girt around, and make her conqueror, and more than conqueror, through God, our helper.

> "The painted folds that fly,
> And lift their emblems, pointed high
> On morning mist and sunset sky—
> Are these the guardians of a land?
> No! if the patriot pulses sleep,
> How vain the watch that hirelings keep;
> How vain the idol flag that waves
> Where conquest, with his iron heel,
> Treads down the standards and the steel
> That belt the soil of slaves."

Let the South, then, awake, and rise to the height of this great argument. It is now a controversy of swords, and not of words; and the issue is, conquest or enslavement. Home and happiness, the purity of wives and daughters, the sanctity of the fireside, the holiness and freedom of our altars, the security of peace, the prosperity of agriculture and commerce, the pursuit of happiness in the walks of science, and the groves of philosophy, and the studios and laboratories of art; above all, honour, principle, and the highest of all prerogatives—that of national sovereignty—these, and whatever else is precious, all stand or fall with victory or defeat. Let every man, woman, and youth, awake, and gird up the loins of their mind, and, with heart and hand, beneath their own blue sky, and amidst their own green land, and the solemn shades of the church-yard cemetery, swear "for those to live, or with them to die."

Blest with a soil productive in all the elements of life and comfort, let these alone suffice, if driven to the last extremity, and let every product for exportation be destroyed, unless our just and equal rights, according to the

laws of nations at war, are recognized and respected by foreign powers.

Let the last words of the gallant Bee become the watchword of every Southern heart: "Let us, fellow-soldiers, determine to die here, and we will conquer." Let Bartow's dying words, as he fell, leading up his regiment to the assault of a battery—"Boys, they have killed me, but never give up this field to the enemy"—be "engraved in our heart of hearts,"* and thus let us

> "Snatch from the ashes of our sires
> The embers of their former fires;
> And he who in the strife expires
> Will add to theirs a name of fear,
> That tyranny will quake to hear."

But let us now turn to the solemn and heartfelt contemplation of this glorious, though blood-bought victory, in its divine aspect.

Victory was a goddess in the classic Pantheon, and the universal Fate of heathenism and false religion was, and is, regarded as the father of gods and men, the arbiter of all

---

* The *Richmond Dispatch* says:

Gen. Bartow died a noble and brave death. He first received a shot which shattered one of his feet; but even in this disabled condition he maintained his place at the head of his men. He had reached a fence which crossed the direction of his charge, and was supporting himself, waving his sword, and cheering his gallant band on to the fight, when some miscreant's ball pierced his brave heart.

The loss of the enemy in the recent battle is variously estimated at from five to ten thousand. Our own loss, which was estimated at five hundred, will, I think, be less, as many who have been reported dead are still living. Gen. Bartow fell before Sherman's battery. A company he had formerly commanded—the Oglethorpe Light Infantry, of Savannah—were lying on their backs loading their muskets, when a perfect storm of balls came in among them, wounding many of them. He seemed perfectly infuriated at this havoc among his *protégés*, and, seizing the colours, rushed forward, saying, "he would take Sherman's battery, or die in the attempt." It was with his second wound he fell—the first one having injured his foot.

A correspondent of the *Cincinnati Gazette* reports, concerning the ill-fated Garnett:

When the rebel General was shot, he was on foot, waving his men back to the conflict. He had waded the Cheat river, on foot, with his men, and when he fell his pantaloons were all dripping with water.

destinies, the disposer of all events, and the irresistible controller of all human actions. We have thus, therefore, in the undissenting voice of humanity, the expression of the doctrine of revelation, that

> "There is a Providence that shapes our ends,
> Rough hew them as we may."

In other words, God is in all, over all, under, and around, and above, all laws, all elements, all forces, all agencies and all agents, whether they be men, or angels, or devils; whether they be powers of darkness, or principalities and powers in heavenly places; that He ruleth over all; that all are His ministers and servants that obey His voice and do His bidding; that this sovereign dominion extends to the minutest atom, and the universal law, so that with Him there is nothing great and nothing mean, the least being as the greatest, and the greatest as the least; and if this is true of all events, even to the falling of a sparrow, and the numbering of the hairs of every head, and if of every situation it may be said: "Surely, God is in this place, and I knew it not," how much more assuredly is this true of that "first and last of fields, king-making victory"—a field, too, which concentrates the energies of nations, the lives of hundreds of thousands, and the lives and fortunes of millions more, now living and hereafter to be born.

War is the sternest exercise of man's highest prerogatives and powers, and the field of battle the theatre of earth's most magnificent array, and of man's most splendid and heroic achievements. It reveals in man the spirit of a fiend, but proclaims an arch-angel fallen. Originated by wicked lusts, and bringing forth the monstrous passions of malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness, of retaliation and blood-thirsty revenge, it also developes the loftiest virtues which can adorn humanity, and illustrates, in their most exalted exercise, magnanimity, honour, patriotism, fortitude, courage, equanimity, and victory over death and the grave.

War is the great tamer, civilizer, reformer and punisher of wild, ferocious, and debased humanity; the rod of God's anger, the besom of destruction, the wine-press of his fury, and the avenger of the just and good; and the executioner of long-delayed wrath upon the unjust, the avaricious, the covenant-breaking, the usurping, tyrannical and licentious, and God-defying, Sabbath-breaking and Bible-perverting nations. War is often, as in this case, provoked by the falsified faith, and covenant-breaking, and sectional, self-aggrandizing policy of seventy years; by the recent triumph of a sectional and anti-constitutional party; by the declaration and demonstration of coercive and hostile force against eleven free, sovereign, and independent States; and is, therefore, wicked, diabolical, and against all right, righteousness, and law, human and divine: or, it may be, as in our case, defensive of every right—constitutional, human, and divine; and the manifestation, therefore, of the highest virtue known to humanity, and entitled to the praise and benediction of the world, and upon which—if conducted in His fear—we may confidently look for the sanction and support of God, who is able to deliver us out of the hands of all that rise up against us.

"The Lord God is," therefore, "a man of war."—Ex. 15 : 3.

"Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain, also, shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig-tree. For my sword shall be bathed in

heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. The sword of the Lord is filled with blood, it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks, with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion."—Isa. 34 : 1–8.

"O, thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? put up thyself into thy scabbard; rest, and be still. How can it be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a charge against Ashkelon, and against the sea shore? there hath he appointed it."—Jer. 47 : 6, 7.

God, therefore, commandeth war, threatens war, inflicts war, and, again, maketh wars to cease. God directs, counsels, and controuls war, and orders all its issues. And God does all this, that men may be afraid of the sword: for wrath bringeth the punishments of the sword, that men may know there is a judgment.

There is a two-fold government of God, with corresponding laws, agencies, ends, restraints, recompenses, and retributions. God has a natural and moral government, the basis of which is truth, justice, honesty, honour, covenant-keeping, upholding and obeying equal and impartial laws, constitutionally formed, and rigidly and impartially administered, and the preservation of pure morality, and family and social order.

Now, God's natural and moral government is adapted to reward those individuals and nations which faithfully maintain these principles, and punish those who violate them, or are partakers and willing associates with their transgressors; and, among the other methods of God's righteous administration of this equal and impartial

justice, is war. God, therefore, promises victory, and threatens defeat, and He brings both to pass according to the counsel of His own will. Arms and armaments, and armies, are vain against His purpose and providence to destroy, and a multitude, with every advantage, are made powerless, and flee before the few and feeble, when disheartened and defeated by a God in arms against them.

"Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee. And all this assembly shall know that the Lord saveth not with sword and spear: for the battle is the Lord's, and He will give you into our hands."—1 Sam. 17 : 45, 46.

And again, we read:

"And at that time Hanani the seer came to Asa, king of Judah, and said unto him: Because thou hast relied on the king of Syria, and not relied on the Lord thy God, therefore is the host of the king of Syria escaped out of thine hand. Were not the Ethiopians and the Lubims a huge host, with very many chariots and horsemen? yet, because thou didst rely on the Lord, he delivered them into thine hand. For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him. Herein thou hast done foolishly: therefore, from henceforth thou shalt have wars."—2 Chron. 16 : 7–9.

And again, in Amaziah's reign:

"But there came a man of God to him, saying, O king, let not the army of Israel go with thee, for the Lord is not with Israel, to wit, with all the children of Ephraim. But if thou wilt go, do it, be strong for the battle: God shall make thee fall before the enemy: for God hath power to help, and to cast down."—2 Chron. 25 : 7, 8.

And such is the meaning of that terrific passage—Deut. 32 : 29–43. God had declared that, as long as His people were faithful and obedient, He would make them victorious and powerful against any number of their enemies, and He there declares that their "latter end" of discomfiture and shameful defeat was altogether the result of His desertion of them. God did, in innumerable instances, fulfil His promises to Israel; and, through his prophets, He has proclaimed for us the same law, for our warning and encouragement. Thus, in the forty-fourth Psalm, and many others, we are taught to say:

"Through thee will we push down our enemies: through thy name will we tread them under that rise up against us. For I will not trust in my bow, neither shall my sword save me. But thou hast saved us from our enemies, and hast put them to shame that hated us. In God we boast all the day long, and praise thy name for ever. Selah. But thou hast cast off, and put us to shame; and goest not forth with our armies. Thou makest us to turn back from the enemy: and they which hate us spoil for themselves. Thou hast given us like sheep appointed for meat; and hast scattered us among the heathen."

And in the Apostle Paul's glowing description of faith:

"And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gedeon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae, of David, also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens."—Heb. 11 : 32–34.

It is thus demonstrated that the conduct of God, as the Sovereign Ruler in His supernatural kingdom, is not contrary to, but in accordance and concurrence with, His natural and moral government of the world. It does not

supersede, but is carried on through, the same laws and instrumentalities, according to their nature, "either necessarily, freely, or contingently." * Human government remains. The same rewards and retributions are employed, and the same coexistence and coöperation of divine and human agency mingle in mysterious union in weaving the web of human destiny.

Of this kingdom the Gospel is the law; the Bible, the charter; Christ, the King; we Ministers, ambassadors; the Church, the sanctuary; Sabbaths, its days of convocation, prayer and praise; salvation, the object; heaven, the goal; and the glory of God's grace and mercy, the final end.

Faith in Christ is the condition of salvation; the principle, and itself the highest exhibition of obedience, the most acceptable sacrifice to God; because it honours His Son, and is the fountain of willing service, the root of every grace, the cementing hand between God and the soul, and the inspirer of peace, and love, and confidence, and joyful exultation in God.

The true believer is, therefore, the most diligent worker. He feels that he can do nothing without God, but every thing with Him. He prays, therefore, as if every thing depended upon God, and works as if every thing depended upon his own exertions—his own skill, and diligence, and fortitude. In war, the Christian principle is embodied in the laconic advice of one who was at once one of the greatest Generals and sincerest of Christians: "Trust in Providence, and keep your powder dry." Faith is the parent and nurse of courage, confidence and heroism. "Add to your faith," says the Apostle, "valour—courage," as the original means. And hence, history attests that, while a religious faith has in all ages sustained heroic valour, and that in proportion to its evangelical purity and power, it

* Confession of Faith.

animates the soul to a dauntless intrepidity and daring chivalry.

"When Robert Bruce had marshalled his little army on the field of Bannockburn, to strive for the independence of Scotland, against the three-fold army of Edward of England, the latter saw the Scottish ranks successively kneeling upon the ground, and exclaimed, arrogantly: 'They are dispirited; they kneel; they supplicate my royal mercy.' 'No sire,' answered a wise and experienced noble at his side: 'they kneel not to you, but to the majesty of heaven. See, the holy man of God passes along their ranks, and they kneel in order to receive by his hands the benediction of God.' And soon the sceptered fool was taught, by the terrible issue of the day, that the humility of the pious Scots was not incompatible with a heroism which swept his proud chivalry as chaff before the whirlwind."

"On that Sabbath morning on which the battle of Lake Champlain was fought, when Commodore Downie, of the British squadron, was sailing down on the Americans, as they lay in the bay of Plattsburg, he sent a man to the mast-head to see what they were doing on Commodore McDonough's ship, the flag-ship of the little American squadron. 'Ho! aloft,' said Downie, 'What are they doing on that ship?' 'Sir,' answered the lookout, 'they are gathered about the main-mast, and they seem to be at prayer.' 'Ah!' said Commodore Downie, 'that looks well for them, but bad for us.' It was bad for the British Commodore. For the very first shot from the American ship was a chain-shot, which cut poor Downie in two, and killed him in a moment. McDonough was a simple, humble Christian, and a man of prayer, but brave as a lion in the hour of battle. He died as he lived—a simple-hearted, earnest Christian."

"Yes," to use the words of Professor Dabney, addressed to the Eighteenth Virginia Regiment, "the sense of God's

favour and trust in His omnipotent providence, are the true basis of courage: and these are to be sought by sinners, as we all are, only in the paths of repentance. The man who has an approving conscience, who has God for his friend, and heaven for his home, may be insensible to fear; for death to him is no evil; and death is the utmost that human malice and power can inflict.

"The man who cultivates the strongest sense of the world to come is, in all ages, the best soldier. So true is this, that even the military religions of Paganism were found the most potent engines to raise men to an exaltation of martial spirit. What made the old Scandinavian the terror of the feudal ages? He had been taught by his religion, that if he died in his bed, his future state would be obscure and ignoble; but if in battle, with his face to the foe, his immortality would be passed in the Walhalla of the Heroes, in perpetual banquet with princes and conquerors. Mohammed taught the Arabs, that he who died for the Koran was a martyr, who went straight to the bliss of paradise. It was this which made the Saracens the terror of Christendom. The Crusaders were authorized by the Romish Church to believe that every one who fell fighting for the Holy Sepulchre, should escape the pains of purgatory, and go at once to the highest heavens. If, now, these superstitious dreams could inspire men with such indifference to death, what should not be the heroism of the enlightened Christian, who has attained the rational evidence that God is his friend; that heaven is his final home; that his life is shielded by an infinite Providence, which makes his injury or death impossible, until death is his truest blessing, and that 'all things must work together for good to him?' Let facts answer this question. While man is, unfortunately, every where a combative being, the truest instances of martial heroism have ever been found among enlightened Christians. Macaulay stated of Cromwell's famous Ironside Regiment, that not only was it

never conquered in battle, but it never met the enemy, whether impetuous Cavalier, or steady Scot, or the boasted chivalry of Spain, that it did not both defeat and crush the body opposed to it. Cromwell's letters give us the origin of this corps. He informed the Commonwealth generals, that he found the Parliament's army too much composed of scurvy materials, such as 'decayed serving-men and tapsters.' 'But I will go,' said he, 'and recruit among the respectable land-owners, and godly people.' Such was the material of his Ironsides; respectable sons of the soil; sons of Christian households, reared in the fear of God; men who to strict discipline joined the fear of God; and who passed from the prayer-meeting to the field of battle, with their Bibles girt under their armour. And such is, emphatically, the constitution of this regiment, drawn from the flower of our section, the sturdy children of the soil. May your sobriety, discipline, and elevated fear of God, make the Eighteenth to be known hereafter as the invincible Ironsides of this war!"

"And yet there are men, I fear, among us, who, because they have experienced only good from the hand of God, are skeptical of his practical concern in the fortunes of men. Theirs is the sneering atheism which was implied in the remark of General Charles Lee, upon the call of our great Washington to fasting, humiliation and prayer, that our fathers might seek the blessing of Divine Providence on their cause. Thus sneered the cynical old unbeliever: 'I have always observed that Divine Providence is on the side of the strongest battalion;' plainly implying that there was no Providence behind those second causes through which He ordinarily works. Now, I might safely propose to all such shallow and senseless thinkers, to let the destinies of these two men, the carping, malignant skeptic, and the Christian statesman and devout believer, decide whether there is a Providence who notes the sneers uttered against His majesty, and is armed with the means of refuting and

avenging them. I say, let the career of the two men decide which was the happier creed? The unbeliever speedily brought the dense cloud of disgrace, crime, and mortification over his fame, on the field of Monmouth; sank into obscurity and contempt, and spent the miserable remainder of his age, deserted of God and man, in a misanthropic solitude. But the man who knew how to honour and acknowledge God in sincerity, was steadily raised by His providence to the most enviable pinnacle of glory to which uninspired mortal ever rose: 'First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.'

"Away, then, with this unbelief which thrusts God out of this world, as stupid as it is wicked. Let us humble ourselves before that almighty and most present Power, which ties our punishment to our sins as a people."*

---

* It is with gladness and gratitude, beyond utterance, says the *North Carolina Presbyterian* of August 17th, that we have read the subjoined letter, just received from one of the divisions of the army of the Potomac. Its writer is an officer of Capt. Mallet's company, of the Third Regiment North Carolina State troops, in camp near Acquia Creek, Virginia. "H." is not, we believe, himself a member of the Church; but our readers will agree with us that he could not have written thus had he not felt a deep interest in the subject of religion; while his evident sympathy with the soldiers of his command is most creditable to him as an officer and a man. May he, too, become a subject of that Divine Grace, of whose work in the hearts of his fellow-soldiers he has hastened to record the earliest manifestations.

"MONDAY MORNING, 4½ o'clock, August 5th, 1861.—I witnessed, last night, one of the most solemn and impressive scenes that I have ever beheld.

"In the open air, with nothing over head but the foliage of the oak and the broad canopy of the heavens, was assembled, just in front of my tent, a large crowd of soldiers for divine worship. David Powell, Third Sergeant in my company, delivered a discourse, which, for simplicity, earnestness, and appropriateness to the occasion, I have seldom heard excelled. He spoke to them in that strain which seemed to reach the hearts of his auditory; and, when he had closed his remarks, he asked, while singing the last hymn, all who were anxious about the salvation of their souls, and who desired to be delivered from that thraldom of sin in which Satan had encompassed them, to remain upon their knees, and he would pray for them. This was the most impressive scene of all—when, at the conclusion of the singing, some fifteen or twenty of the soldiers (and I am glad to say, many of them from my own company) were seen on bended knees, as if in silent prayer to Almighty God for mercy and for a safe deliverance from all the dangers and temptations that beset the soldier's path. Then were they prayed for by one of the professors of religion present, and I firmly believe that the prayers reached the Throne of Grace, and were acceptable."

The hand of God in this victory, and His powerful providence in shaping all man's ends, rough hewn and ordered by his wisest skill, is manifest, both in the antecedent events and in the battle itself. There is reason to believe that the schemes of neither of the master-spirits that planned the battle were consummated. The Duke of Wellington has recorded as his experience, that, however wisely a General may plan a battle, when once it commences, God takes the controul of events into His own hands, and all man's foresight is baffled and set at naught by new and unexpected exigencies. It was so here. McDowell, as he reports, intended to have made but one attack, and to have made that three days sooner. Beauregard intended, it would seem, to attack, and not await an assault, and then to draw them back within his entrenchments, and surround and cut them off.

The accomplishment of McDowell's object was defeated by waiting for Patterson's reinforcements, and the unintended battle and retreat of Bull's Run, on Thursday. Had he been reinforced, and appeared at Manassas on Thursday or Friday, Beauregard would not have had one-half his army—would probably have been overwhelmed by an overpowering force. God, therefore, interposed to secure delay; to delude Patterson into tardiness; to give expedition and success to Johnston's retreat and conjunction at Manassas; to bring into the field at successive periods of the day Beauregard's reinforcements, so as to give the appearance of fresh reserves and of illimitable numbers; to enable Beauregard to delay the final onset and victory—which was really secure at one o'clock—until he was fully prepared to realize all its benefits in a total rout, capture, and spoils.

And who but God caused such an unnecessary, inexcusable, and total panic, rout, and abandonment of military stores, to the value of some million and a-half of dollars? This is argued by all the Federal Generals and specta-

tors, including Dr. Russell, to have been entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable by any thing that had occurred, and is wholly inexplicable upon any of the numerous absurd pretexts assigned for it, since, as our enemies declare, they had, up till then, driven us back and beaten us at every point, not knowing that this falling back of our forces was a part of our strategy. We are, therefore, compelled to recognize in this panic the consummation of all God's previous providential preparations, as when of old he scattered the Assyrians and Midianites, and to ascribe salvation and triumphant victory to the Lord.

Let us accept this war as a just judgment upon our ungodly land; as a call to repentance, faith, and prayer; as a test of religious principle and moral fortitude; as a developement of Southern national unity; as a baptism of blood for the consecration of this new Republic; and as a means of reformation of manners, and revival of religion.

Let us us recognize His providence and favorable goodness in this victory. "The horse is prepared against the day of battle, but victory is of the Lord"—(Prov. 28 : 31). Let not our spirit be that of Julius Cæsar: "I came, I saw, I conquered;" but, in the spirit which led John Sobieski, after his triumph over the Turks, to say, "I came, I saw, God conquered." "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God." "Our fathers trusted in Thee, and Thou didst deliver them." Let us say, with His people of old:

"The Lord wrought a great victory that day."

"Wherefore David blessed the Lord before all the congregation: and David said, Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel, our father, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thy hand is

power and might; and in thy hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all. Now, therefore, our God, we thank thee, and praise thy glorious name."

"O sing unto the Lord a new song: for he hath done marvellous things: his right hand, and his holy arm, hath gotten him the victory. The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen. He hath remembered his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all the earth: make a loud noise, and rejoice, and sing praise. Sing unto the Lord with the harp; with the harp, and the voice of a psalm. With trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord, the King. Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together before the Lord; for he cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity."

"Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord, and spake, saying, I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea. The Lord is my strength and song, and he is become my salvation: he is my God, and I will prepare him an habitation; my father's God, and I will exalt him. The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name." "The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my lust shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword; mine hand shall destroy them. Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters." "Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously."

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA.

As the ancient Israelite walked about Zion, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth—marked well her bulwarks, and considered her palaces, that he might tell it to the generations following—so, with conscious pride, we have been accustomed to speak of the glory of our undivided Church, extending from the ice-fields on the North to the orange-groves in the South, and reaching from the Atlantic ocean to the Pacific, with Presbyteries and Churches in all lands—insomuch that the peals of her Sabbath morning bells, following the chariot wheels of the sun, echoed around the whole earth! Was it not a venial weakness to boast of such a Church, which, like the oak, with centuries upon its boughs, had resisted many a storm, and stood proudly erect in defiance of the raging elements of discord that had sundered nearly all other Churches in the land? But God, in His mysterious providence, had decreed that we, too, should be divided in twain: not by any discordant elements within our own bosom, nor by any intrinsic defect of our ecclesiastical system or Church polity, but by the parting asunder of the State, whose inevitable separation our Church, no doubt, like the girding bands around the ship that Paul was in, retarded. But, as the heaving earthquake snaps asunder rocks and mountains, and even continents, so the resistless upheavings of the State, which has severed our majestic empire into two, has carried with it all other interests, political, commercial, social, educational, and religious: so that the division of the great Presbyterian Church was absolutely unavoidable. The "Spring resolutions," adopted

by the Philadelphia Assembly, did not divide the Church. But, strange to tell, (and here we see the finger of God manifestly,) those resolutions served, like President Lincoln's war proclamation, to make a unit of the South! But for that action, there were many (and who could blame them?) that would still have been loath to take final leave of a Church so dearly beloved; some, who had kindred and loved ones there; some, who had often taken sweet counsel with pious and congenial spirits there; some, who had sat at the feet of revered instructors there; and some, amongst whom we number ourselves, who felt proud at the greatness and majesty of the wide-extended and undivided Church! Such would have been slow in taking the necessary steps to a separate organization: and with many a pang, and many a bitter tear, they would have finally cut the last connecting cord that bound them to the mother Church. With their harps hung upon the willows, their sad lament would have been: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth—if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." But those "Spring resolutions," so unnecessary in fact, so much in defiance of all sound reason, so contrary to wise policy, (according to man's wisdom,) and in open violation of the Constitution of the Church, God, as it would seem, permitted to be discussed with such an *animus*, and passed by such a majority, for the sole purpose of making an instantaneous unit of the Southern Churches! So that, without a murmuring word, a jarring sound, or a lingering thought, the entire Confederate Church moved, simultaneously, and with one accord, to the organization of a new Assembly, and the fulfilment of a new destiny. Let us "stand still and consider the wonderful works of God!"

Never was there an Assembly looked forward to with more intense interest than that which was recently organized in the city of Augusta, Georgia, on Wednesday, the

fourth day of December, 1861. For months previously, it was the subject of thought, conversation, and newspaper articles. Every ministerial delegate throughout the entire Confederacy, extending from the borders of Maryland to the remotest bounds of Texas and the Indian Territory, was there. The deficiency, which was comparatively small, was in the Eldership from the South-Western portions of the Church. As an illustration of the unusual interest felt in the assembling of this body, we would mention, amongst other facts of similar significancy, that a Judge, of Tennessee, suspended his Courts in order that he might attend the body as an Elder. Another distinguished Judge, of Florida, obtained permission from the Legislature, as we are informed, to postpone his Court, that he might take his seat in the Assembly. And still another honorable gentleman, of North Carolina, declined being a candidate for a high and responsible post, to which he was certain to have been elected, had he consented to let his name go before the people, since the duties of that post would have required him to be in the city of Richmond at the same time that the Assembly was organized at Augusta, and he preferred taking a place in the courts at the Lord's house, to a seat in the Electoral College at the Capitol.

There were but few young men in that body. The average age of the Commissioners was over fifty years. The Assembly was composed, for the most part, of those who had, in some way, received the confidence of the Church and of their fellow-men, such as Moderators of former Assemblies, Presidents and Professors in Colleges, Teachers in Theological Seminaries, former Secretaries of the Boards of the Church, authors, editors, and faithful pastors, besides physicians, statesmen, judges, and jurists of high distinction. There were, in the body, three former Moderators of the old Assembly, viz: Dr. James H. Thornwell, Dr. Aaron W. Leland, and Dr. Francis McFarland. The Ruling Eldership was remarkable for its distinguished

ability, and rendered important, nay, indispensable, services in the proceedings of the Assembly. Amongst this portion of the membership, we can not forbear the mention of the name of the venerable and honorable Chancellor Job Johnston, now one of the Supreme Judges of the State of South Carolina, to whose opinions on all subjects, but especially those of parliamentary order, of charters, and of all legal questions, the Assembly paid the most marked respect; and those of Judge Wm. A. Forward, of Florida, Judge J. G. Shepherd, of North Carolina, Judge J. T. Swayne, of Tennessee, Hons. W. S. Mitchell, of Georgia, Wm. P. Webb, of Alabama, Thos. C. Perrin, and Wm. P. Finley, of South Carolina, and Dr. J. H. Dickson, of North Carolina. These Elders, and many others that we might mention, were most valuable components of the body. And it may not be improper to state, in this historical sketch, that, aside from the regular members of the body, there were other distinguished Divines in attendance, as visitors, whose valuable counsel was not unappreciated in the deliberations of the House. Indeed, we hesitate not to say that, for wisdom, talent, learning, piety, and rich experience, the Assembly, as a whole, was a most august body of men, for which the Church might well be humbly thankful. *

The style of the deliberations of such a body may be easily inferred from its character. The business, which

---

* An esteemed brother of the Assembly took pains to ascertain the various descent of the members of the body. His investigations resulted in the discovery of the following facts, which, as a matter of curiosity, we give, as follows, viz: There were in the body ninety-three members, fifty-three Teaching, and thirty-eight Ruling Elders. Of the latter, twenty were Scotch-Irish, nine English, (not one Puritan), six Scotch, and three Huguenots. Of the fifty-five Preachers, twenty-eight were Scotch-Irish, eighteen English, (nine Puritans), five Scotch, two Huguenots, and two German Reformed. Of the thirty-eight Ruling Elders, fifteen were farmers (or planters), twelve lawyers, four merchants, three physicians, two teachers, one mechanic, and one banker.

extended through eleven days, was marked by earnest discussion. Each member seemed to feel resting upon him a solemn and weighty responsibility. There were no set speeches. Truth, and only truth, was clearly the object of every debater. Consequently, the remarks of members were, for the most part, animated, short, and to the point. The Moderator's work was comparatively easy. He rarely, if ever, had occasion to call a member to order. No papers were ruthlessly "laid on the table," in order to get rid of them. The inexorable "previous question" was not passed on a single occasion, nor was it called for more than once, so far as we recollect, and then was not sustained by the House; nor was there any "unfinished business" postponed to the next Assembly. Although it would have been a miracle if the delegates, coming up from twelve States and territories, and from extremes nearly two thousand miles apart, had all seen exactly eye to eye, in all things, yet the proceedings were characterized by a most delightful, indeed, wonderful, harmony. It was emphatically a feast of love. How vividly did we realize the truth and the spirit of that precious song of David: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments. As the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commandeth the blessing, even life for ever more."

At the appointed time, the Commissioners all being assembled in the First Presbyterian Church, a marked and deep solemnity visibly pervading the entire body, the Rev. John W. Waddel, D. D., of the Presbytery of Memphis, arose and said: "It will not, I trust, be regarded as an unwarrantable liberty in me, inasmuch as I have been one of the Committee to receive the commissions of the Commissioners appointed to the General Assembly of the

Church in the Confederate States of America, to rise, for the purpose of proposing a presiding officer for the Assembly, under the remarkable circumstances which have assembled us together, and who shall assist in the permanent organization of this Assembly. I nominate, therefore, as a temporary presiding officer, Dr. Francis McFarland, from the Synod of Virginia, Presbytery of Lexington—one every way suited to fill the high office—one venerable and respected, both on account of his age, and his long and valuable services to the Church."

The nomination was approved by acclamation, and Dr. McFarland took the chair, and said; "I take the chair in obedience to the expressed will of my brethren here assembled. The subject which first occupies our attention is the election of a brother to preach the opening Sermon. It has been extensively circulated, as the wish of the brethren, that the Rev. Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, should perform this duty, and though it has been stated by the secular papers that I would do so, being the last Moderator present, yet I do not think it at all obligatory upon us to observe this rule; nor do I wish for any thing but that which is perfectly agreeable to you, as it is necessary for us all to proceed with harmony in our organization. I therefore take the liberty to nominate Dr. Palmer to preach the opening Sermon."

The nomination was sustained unanimously by the House. And, after the preliminary services, Dr. Palmer arose in the pulpit, and said:

"Fathers and Brethren: This Assembly is convened under circumstances of unusual solemnity, and any one of us might well shrink from the responsibility of uttering the first words which are to be spoken here. I see before me venerable men, whom the Church of God has honoured with the highest mark of her confidence—men venerable for their wisdom, no less than for their age—who should, perhaps, as your organ, speak to-day in the hearing of the

nation, and of the Church. But a providence, which I have had no hand in shaping, seems to have devolved upon me this duty, as delicate as it is solemn. It only remains for me to bespeak your sympathy, and to implore the Divine blessing upon what I may be able to say from the concluding words of the first chapter of Ephesians: "And gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church; which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all."

From these words, the gifted preacher delivered an able and eloquent discourse on the Headship of Christ over the Church. This Sermon the Assembly afterwards ordered to be published in the Appendix to the Minutes.

The Assembly was then constituted, Dr. McFarland still presiding. The roll of the Commissioners being announced by Dr. Waddel, there were found to be present ninety-three members; fifty-five of whom were Ministers, and thirty-eight Elders. Had the roll been complete, there would have been, in all, one hundred and ten members.

There were three nominations for the office of Moderator, viz: the Rev. R. H. Morrison, D. D., of North Carolina; Rev. John N. Waddel, D. D., of Tennessee; and the Rev. Benjamin M. Palmer, D. D., of New Orleans. The Rev. Dr. Morrison said: "It would, indeed, give me pleasure to fulfil any duty that this body might see fit to devolve upon me, but I have been for years in bad health, and could not discharge the duties of the office aright: I therefore hope that my name will be withdrawn, inasmuch as there are many men here who are much better qualified for the task than I am."

Dr. Waddel said: "I hope that I, also, may be allowed to withdraw my name, and I move that Dr. Palmer be elected by acclamation."

Dr. Palmer was then unanimously elected, and, after being conducted to the Moderator's chair, by Drs. Thornwell and Waddel—appointed for that purpose—before taking his seat, he said: "I should have a heart, brethren,

hard to be moved, if I were not penetrated by a sense of your kindness—a kindness twice manifested to me to-day. Under other circumstances, I should ascend to the duties of this Chair with extreme embarrassment, for I am bound to say, that I have but a very slight acquaintance with parliamentary rules and principles, with the forms of proceeding, even in our own Church. It will not surprise me if I am compelled to throw myself upon the charity of my brethren. It shall be my attempt to preside with firmness, kindness, and impartiality, and I shall throw myself upon the kindness of this body for any errors I may commit. I trust that we may enjoy, in an unusual degree, the outpouring of God's Spirit, and that we may labour with earnestness to cause our Church to enter vigorously upon the great work that God has set for it."

The Assembly then proceeded to elect its officers, both temporary and permanent. The Rev. D. McNeill Turner, D. D., of South Carolina, was chosen Temporary Clerk; the Rev. John W. Waddel, D. D., of Tennessee, Stated Clerk; and the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., of Georgia, Permanent Clerk of the Assembly.

The body now being completely organized and equipped for business, the first thing that came up was a paper introduced by Dr. Thornwell, who said: "It seems to me that now is as proper a time as we can select for a very solemn act which we ought to perform. We begin our existence now as an independent Presbyterian Church; we now constitute a formal bond of union between all those Presbyteries and Synods formerly under the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, within the limits of the Confederate States. Our Presbyteries have severally expressed their deference to that system of faith and government held by that Church, and our Synods have done the same. But I think that this Assembly should adopt the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Forms of Discipline and Worship, and

thus have a basis upon which we can proceed. I therefore beg leave to offer the following resolutions;" which, after some discussion, were slightly amended, and are as follows, viz:

Resolved, That the style and title of this Church shall be *the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.*

Resolved, That this Assembly solemnly declare, in conformity with the unanimous decisions of our Presbyteries, that the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship, which together make up the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, are the Constitution of this Church, only substituting the term "Confederate" States for "United" States.

The Moderator, in due time, announced the Committees usually appointed on such occasions. But, in the present instance, more than ordinary interest was felt in the Committees, since their work was not simply to review what had been done by the Assembly's Boards during the past year, as heretofore; but to remodel, reconstruct, and build anew the various agencies by means of which the Assembly was to prosecute its general schemes of benevolence. This was especially true of what may be termed the prime Committees, viz:

I. On Bills and Overtures—Of which the Rev. Francis McFarland, D. D., was the Chairman.

II. On Judicial Business—Rev. R. H. Morrison, D. D., Chairman.

III. On Theological Seminaries—Rev. Peyton Harrison, Chairman.

IV. On Foreign Missions—Rev. James B. Ramsay, D. D., Chairman.

V. On Domestic Missions—Rev. C. C. Jones, D. D., Chairman.

VI. On Education—Rev. Drury Lacy, D. D., Chairman.

VII. On Publication—Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., Chairman.

VIII. On Church Extension—Rev. R. W. Bailey, D. D., Chairman.

IX. On Systematic Benevolence—Rev. John B. Adger, D. D., Chairman.

X. On the Narrative of Religion—Rev. Aaron W. Leland, D. D., Chairman.

XI. On Foreign Correspondence—Rev. Theodoric Pryor, D. D., Chairman.

An animated and rather protracted debate sprung up, in the early part of the second day's proceedings, relative to the exact ecclesiastical *status* of the Presbytery of the Potomac, of late in connexion with the Synod of Baltimore. The Rev. Dr. John H. Bocock, and others, claimed that that Presbytery should be entered upon the roll as belonging to the Synod of Baltimore, which still holds its connexion with the old Assembly. They urged that the Synod of Baltimore, although still in actual connexion with the Northern Assembly, was, nevertheless, in sympathy and feeling with us, and that, no doubt, so soon as Maryland was free to choose, she would join the Confederacy; and that the Synod of Baltimore, or, at all events, a majority of its Presbyteries, would, in like manner, declare for the Confederate Church. They feared that refusing to enroll the Synod of Baltimore might be construed as evidence of a want of due sympathy for the brethren there, whilst enrolling it, would not only evince our kindly feeling, but be prophetic of what would, in due time, doubtless, take place. Whilst, on the other hand, it was maintained that the Presbytery of the Potomac, in seceding from the Northern Church, did, *de facto*, and of necessity, secede from the Synod of Baltimore, which still adheres to that Church, as the less is contained in the greater; and that, however much this Assembly sympathizes with the brethren belonging to the Synod of Baltimore, and looks forward with pleasure to

the time when they should be component parts of our own body, yet there was a manifest impropriety in enrolling that Synod as belonging to us, when, in fact, it belonged to the other body. "Suppose," said one of the speakers, "that your Presbytery, instead of coming to us, had gone to the Cumberland Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists, or the Episcopalians, and should still claim their relation to the Synod of Baltimore, would it not be preposterous? Now, I ask if coming to us is not precisely the same thing? Are we not just as separate from the old Assembly as they are? I do not see how it is possible to belong to both Assemblies at the same time." The matter was then referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, who reported a minute, which was adopted, and which was to the effect that the Clerk, in making out the roll, should enroll the Presbyteries of Winchester and of the Potomac, not as belonging to the Synod of Baltimore, but as "heretofore in connexion with the Synod of Baltimore."

At an early stage of the proceedings of the body, Dr. Thornwell offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted, viz:

Resolved, That a Committee, consisting of one Minister and one Elder from each of the Synods belonging to this Assembly, be appointed to prepare an address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ through the earth, setting forth the causes of our separation from the Church in the United States, our attitude in relation to slavery, and a general view of the policy which, as a Church, we intend to pursue.

In obedience to this resolution, the Moderator appointed the following members of the Assembly on said Committee:

Ministers.—James H. Thornwell, D. D., Theodoric Pryor, D. D., F. K. Nash, R. McInnis, C. C. Jones, D. D., R. B. White, D. D., Professor W. D. Moore, James A. Gillespie, John L. Boozer, R. W. Bailey, D. D.

Elders.—J. D. Armstrong, Charles Phillips, Joseph A. Brooks, W. P. Finley, Samuel McCorkle, William P.

Webb, William C. Black, T. L. Dunlap, and E. W. Wright.

This Committee, some days after their appointment, reported, through their Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Thornwell, "An Address to the Churches," etc., which was listened to by the entire body, with evident and profound sensation, and was not only unanimously adopted, but, on motion of A. W. Putnam, afterwards amended by William P. Webb, the original document was ordered to "be filed in the archives of the Assembly, and that a paper be attached thereto, to be signed by the Moderator and members of this Assembly"—which was in due form done.

"This able and remarkably powerful address contained a valuable exposition of the position of the Southern Church, its reasons for secession from the Northern Assembly, and its position, especially in regard to slavery. But this argument is one which can not be condensed. Every line is important, to show the connexion of the argument—every word is full of meaning. We will not, therefore, attempt to give a sketch of it." The Assembly ordered the Stated Clerk to print three thousand copies of the Address for general circulation.

In the morning of the third day's proceedings, the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, Secretary of the Provisional Committee of Foreign Missions, presented the Committee's report of what they had done since the separation of the Southern Presbyteries from the old Assembly. From this report, it appears that, although "in relation to the Foreign Missionary work, our people had neither the disposition nor the facilities for further coöperation with their Northern brethren, they were not unmindful, however, of their obligations to the Great Head of the Church. They were willing to sustain their full share of the common burthen, and, in the providence of God, this was assigned them, in connexion with the care of the Indian Mission, and in the support of such Missionaries, in the more remote field, as

had gone from the South. At the same time, the Indian Missions were cut off from all further connexion with the Board at New York, and would have been entirely broken up, if some speedy and suitable provision had not been made for sustaining and carrying them on. The Committee proposed nothing more than to sustain and take the controul of these Missions, and, also, provide for the support of the Missionaries above referred to, until such time as the Church should organize, and take the whole matter into their own hands."

Dr. Wilson also made a report of his visit to the Indian Missions. "There are five large, and a few small tribes in the Indian country, viz: the Choctaws, Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, and Chickasaws, besides the Osages, Shawnees, Camanches, etc., numbering in all about one hundred thousand souls. Each particular tribe has a Chief and Common Council, like the States. They were formerly under the protectorate of the United States, but are now about to form a compact with the Confederacy." "There were eight boarding-schools, containing about five hundred scholars—these schools being supported partly by the Missionary Board, and partly by the Indian fund. To carry on this Mission, about twenty thousand dollars will be needed, and it is to be hoped that the Church will take this subject into their earnest consideration. The condition of these Missions is very interesting, and certainly improved. There are now over *fourteen hundred* communicants in the churches."

It is with deep and pleasing interest we look forward to the not very distant day when the Indian territory shall become one of these Confederate States, and when the red man shall legitimately claim his seat, not only in our Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, but also in our Legislative Halls and Senate Chambers. This desirable consummation can be brought about only by evangelical influences. The Gospel is the most efficient of all the

forerunners of civilization. Hence, it is not only a dictate of Christian charity, but of political wisdom, to give liberally to the cause of Indian Missions. To evangelize the red man on our Western border, and the black man in the midst of us, seems, in the providence of God, to be the peculiar mission and high privilege of the Confederate Church and States. And if such be the fact, which we doubt not, have we not reason to adore the goodness and wisdom of the wonderful providence of God in the extraordinary trials through which the nation is now passing!

These missionary exercises, which were so encouraging and gratifying to the Assembly, were immediately followed by others scarcely less interesting, viz: the address of the Rev. Henry Quigg, Delegate from the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, and the reply of the Moderator. The eloquent and stirring discourse of the Delegate was listened to by the House with thrilling interest. In the course of his remarks the speaker, in presenting a summary view of the extent and strength of the Synod which he represented, said: "We have nine Presbyteries, and some seventy Ministers, zealously engaged in the discharge of the duties of their proper functions. We have upwards of one hundred churches and five thousand communicants. Sabbath Schools are established in connexion with nearly, if not quite, all our churches; and in those churches space is usually set apart for the accommodation of our coloured fellow-men, whom God, in His providence, has placed under our protection. Some of our Pastors have displayed a commendable zeal in the in-gathering and instruction of this element in our population. We have two institutions located in South Carolina, one literary, the other theological, established and controlled by our Synod, and both manned by faithful and efficient professors. Hitherto, these institutions have been prosperous, beyond the most sanguine expectations of the founders; indeed, under the smiles of a fostering Providence, they have been as founts from

whence streams have issued to made glad the city of our God. We have several probationers engaged in the work of faith and labour of love through the vacancies and sparsely settled sections of the South-Western States. Our churches, it will be seen, are widely scattered over a broad area—the field occupied being, I may say, coextensive with the Southern States." * * * *

"We can now sympathize with each other more fully and freely, and feel the ties of love, religion, and patriotism binding us more closely in a common brotherhood. We are one in blood; one in the heritage of a glorious ancestry; one in resistance to tyranny and error, whether ecclesiastical, or political, or both; one in faith; one in doctrine; and substantially one in practice; and hence, for the body that I represent, and for myself, personally, I extend to you the warmest greetings of my nature.

"Nay, indulge me further: Since God, in His providence, has severed the ties which bound you to the North; now that you are cut off from all external affiliation with her, for substantially the same reason with ourselves; since we are both called to labour in the same field, and are both fighting the battles of the Lord against infidelity, fanaticism, and tyranny; engaged in the same warfare, both with carnal and spiritual weapons; both reduced to similar straits, and drawn towards each other by the softening, conforming influences emanating from a common adversity, and being exercised by a sanctified affliction, and thereby drawn nearer to the centre, Jesus, and nearer and nearer one another; may we not indulge the fond hope that the set time to favour our beloved Zion has come, and that the King and Head of the Church, who makes the wrath of man to praise Him, and places wars and revolutions, and the counsels of rulers, and the debates of Senates, under tribute to the advancement and exaltation of His kingdom, has determined that at this historic period, while the nation stands amazed at the wonderful developements of Provi-

dence in obliterating past party asperities, and harmonizing public sentiment, while our sympathies, our piety, and our patriotism, all burn and glow to a white heat, we should be indissolubly *welded* together. As in Australia, Ireland, and the British Provinces, may we not be united, as Presbyterians, in solid phalanx, and go forth with a momentum commensurate with our numbers and resources, overturning every obstacle that should oppose the progress of Messiah's kingdom, conquering and to conquer—the last victory eclipsing the first in the splendour of its achievement. Could this object, to which earnest allusion has been recently made by so many of your Church Sessions, Presbyteries, and at least one Synod, be attained, on a satisfactory and an equitable basis, it would, indeed, be a delightful consummation, and one, I believe, that, to the hearts of many in the Church I represent, would send a thrill of joy. These remarks, it will be understood, are entirely unofficial. But, let me say, whether we are organically united or no, let us at least be united in the bonds of Christian affection; and, while in separate spheres we stand up manfully for Christ and His crown, let us, also, stand up to one another, hand to hand, shoulder to shoulder, and heart to heart."

Dr. Palmer, the Moderator, replied:

"This Assembly extends to you, sir, and the Church which you represent, a reciprocal and cordial greeting. The Presbyterian Church has always had the strongest attachment to that common standard of faith and order to which you have alluded—that system, in devotion to which, and for the preservation of which, we have been called to go through many trials, and sufferings, and afflictions. But along with this fervent attachment to the truth, as set forth in our Constitution, we have ever desired to cherish a large affection to all the branches of the Church of God, and to none more cordially than to that which you represent. You are of our family, and we of yours. We

are sprung from a common ancestry; we have the same historic memories; we have had the same conflicts for the truth, and the Church of God. We dwell in the same house, and sit around the same board. We are bound together by the strongest cords of affection and love. Every sentiment expressed by you finds an echo in the breast of every member here. What you have expressed as a wish, and unofficially, may, I trust, turn out a prophecy. May we see the purpose of God in all these political overturnings, in bringing together, in one common body, those who have been too long separated by differences which Christian charity may enable us to overleap; so that, with one heart and one mind, we may labour to increase the Redeemer's kingdom. Bear with you, to the Church which you represent, the cordial salutations of this Assembly."

The venerable Dr. Francis McFarland, in a few pertinent remarks, expressed, no doubt, the sentiment of every member of the Assembly, when he said: "I do trust that the time is coming when we shall no longer be numerically two bodies, for there are very few things which keep us apart, and I know that there is a strong leaning, on both sides, to union. But we must not be pressed together. Let us rather be drawn by the cords of love. I, for one, thank the brother for his kind address."

The Rev. Dr. R. B. McMullen, the Chairman of a large Committee, to whom was referred a paper offered by Judge J. T. Swayne, for the closer union and communion of Christians, presented, at a subsequent stage of the proceedings, a report, which, being amended, was adopted, and from which the following extract is pertinent in this connexion:

To the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, who have several times heretofore conferred with us, and who have so kindly and fraternally greeted us on the present occasion, the Assembly feels drawn with the strongest cords of brotherly love. Theirs is a precious ancestry, who gave a noble testimony for the truth, lifting up a glorious banner against error, and battling faithfully for

Christ and His crown. Towards them our hearts go out in cordial affection, and the Assembly feels that, in the present afflicting circumstances that surround both denominations, no ordinary difficulties should be allowed to keep them asunder. Both have the same faith and polity; the same heavenly Father, and precious Jesus, and Holy Comforter; with one heart, and one hope, bearing substantially the same name, contending against the same enemy, and having the same symbols. Why, then, should they compose two denominations?

In regard to psalmody, which separates us, this Assembly already have fifty-two of the psalms used by the Associate Reformed Church in our book of praise, and now propose that, when another edition is published, which must of necessity be at an early day, they will publish the entire one hundred and fifty psalms in the beginning of the book, if that will be satisfactory to this sister Church. This will bring both bodies nearer to the practice of the good old mother Church of Scotland and Ireland, from which both Churches have descended, as she uses the one hundred and fifty psalms, together with paraphrases and hymns.

This Assembly now cordially greets her sister, and makes her this offer of amity and union. And that the subject may be brought to the consideration of the entire body as soon as practicable, the Stated Clerk of this Assembly is hereby directed to forward a copy of this paper to the Stated Clerk of each Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church, at an early day.

We would here conclude, in this historical review, all we have to say on this very important subject of Christian union and communion, by inserting the report of the Rev. Dr. Theodoric Pryor, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence:

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, appreciating the precious import of that memorable prayer, addressed by the adorable Redeemer to the Father, in full view of the agony, the Garden, and the Cross—"That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may also be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me"—and, impelled by a sincere desire to meet the full measure of responsibility which devolves upon us, as a branch of Christ's visible Church, in the accomplishment of this vastly important petition, would most earnestly endeavour to draw closer the bonds of Christian intercourse and communion between all Churches, of like faith and order with ourselves, in the Confederate States. This Assembly, therefore, affectionately solicits fraternal correspondence with the following Churches, to wit: The Associate Reformed Synod of the South; the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church; the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; the Congregation

of Independent Presbyterians, and the German Reformed Church. And in order to consummate this, our Christian purpose and desire, the Assembly will, at its present session, appoint and commission delegates to the aforesaid Churches, with full power and authority to arrange and adopt articles of permanent intercourse and correspondence; which articles, however, shall be submitted to the Assembly for its ratification or rejection.

On motion to adopt the report, the Hon. Chancellor Johnston moved that the "Evangelical Lutheran Church of South Carolina and adjacent States" be inserted in the list of Churches to which this Assembly will send delegates. This gave rise to a discussion on the true nature of Christian communion. The views finally acquiesced in by the body seemed to be those expressed by Dr. Thornwell, as follows:

"There are two kinds of communion. *First*, Christian communion: communion between saints, and the communion of saints with Christ, their Master. This Church has always acknowledged this sort of communion with those who acknowledged Christ as their Lord and Master—as the Saviour of sinners, and one of the persons in the adorable Trinity. I am astonished to hear it intimated that we hold at arms' length any who think thus of Jesus. I have always admitted to the Lord's Table, Methodists, Baptists—all who admit the doctrine of the Trinity—and, if that is not Christian communion, I am utterly at a loss to conceive what Christian communion is. Our Church does not propose to take any new step on this subject, and if you pass a law to that effect, you will seem to imply that heretofore you have not admitted them.

"Now, there is a *second* kind of communion—that is, in the courts of the Church. These courts are not designed to express love to the Master—our spiritual commnnion and fellowship; but these courts are intended for the government of the Church; as rulers, they meet together for the purpose of deliberating and investigating the various questions before them, and of deciding what is in accord-

ance with the word of God. Into this ecclesiastical communion, we invite those who sympathize with us in the general measures for the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; those who agree with us as to the great principles on which the Church should be administered. It seems to me, therefore, preposterous to invite into this communion those who differ from us *toto cœlo.* Christian communion is as broad and free in our Church as any man on the face of the earth could desire it. But, as far as ecclesiastical union is concerned, you defeat the very object you have in view, as soon as you entertain a number of heterogeneous faiths and orders. Again, there is another important consideration for us. We are now going forth, in our separate and independent organization, as a new Church. We are, so to speak, strangers, who now first make their appearance. In our Address to the Churches, we have made our bow, and invited ecclesiastical communion with us of those of the same faith as ourselves. The *onus* of accepting or rejecting rests with them. I think we are perfectly right in taking the action of the last Assembly as our precedent in regard to this matter. Our disruption with that Assembly is not a disruption of our ecclesiastical communion with those Churches; and I submit, that this is as far as we can go with any propriety. It would not be consistent with our position to do any thing more. Take up the subject where the last Assembly left it, and follow it out, as our changed circumstances permit. But let us not confound our ecclesiastical with our Christian relations. It is only Presbyterians that we can consistently invite to take part in our discussions and deliberations; and it would be an insult to invite any one to take part with you, when they believed you to be unscriptural in your views and doctrines." The report was adopted, without the amendment proposed by Chancellor Johnston.

It seems to us exceedingly desirable, at this peculiar crisis in both our national and ecclesiastical history, when old things are passing away; when both Church and State are, as it were, bursting their old shells, and casting them off, in order that they may assume new ones, of larger dimensions, and better suited to the progress of knowledge and humanity; and, on taking a new start in the career of usefulness and high attainments, that all Christians of like faith and practice should "*close up*," to use the language of the Rev. Dr. Foote, "shoulder to shoulder, in an unbroken column, in order that our charge upon the enemies of truth and righteousness, in every form and shape, may be irresistible!" Why should we stand upon technicalities or punctilios? Are not these trifles in comparison with union, which is strength? And yet union, without implicit confidence, is union only in form—it is no union—it is worse than no union; instead of adding strength, it only becomes an element of weakness. Let all true Presbyterians, therefore, become one body, but one in a way that will remove all suspicion, and beget the most hearty confidence, without which the so-called union would be a curse, rather than a blessing.

In obedience to the recommendation contained in the report, the Assembly appointed the following Corresponding Delegates, viz:

To the Associate Reformed Synod of the South—The Rev. David Wills, principal; and the Rev. D. McNeill Turner, D. D., alternate.

To the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church—The Rev. G. D. Armstrong, D. D., principal; and the Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., alternate.

To the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church—The Rev. R. B. McMullen, D. D., principal; and the Rev. John Hunter, alternate.

To the Convention of Independent Presbyterians—The Rev. Wm. Banks, principal; and the Rev. A. A. James, alternate.

To the German Reformed Church—The Rev. Dr. R. H. Morrison, principal; and the Rev. D. A. Penick, alternate.

There were two days during the Sessions of the Assembly that were termed, *par excellence*, the "Lawyers' days," as the subjects of discussion on those days were such as to draw out the legal skill and learning of several of the Ruling Elders in the body. And in nothing was the excellence of our Church polity, which provides for such an element in all our Church courts, more clearly demonstrated than in the discussions that took place on the occasions referred to. The one was, the debate that arose on the offering of the following resolution by Rev. R. McInnis:

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed, and instructed to take the proper steps to secure a legal title to all property within the Confederate States to which, in their judgment, the Presbyterian Church in these States possess an equitable claim.

The other was, the discussion that took place, in a subsequent stage of the proceedings, on the adoption of the report of the Committee on Charters. It was manifest to every one, that the aid rendered, on these occasions, by the legal gentlemen on the floor, was absolutely indispensable to the successful action of the House. The truth is, that although the Church is, and ought to be, entirely separate from the world, yet, at the same time, it is conterminous with the world; and, accordingly, the polity of our Church admits into its official management men who are acquainted, as it were, with the landmarks separating the Church from the world.

The Church, being "the body of Christ," is the representative of Christ on the earth. And as Christ, whilst on the earth, went about doing good, and preaching the Gospel, so the true mission of the organized Church in the

world is to spread the Gospel, until the whole world is evangelized. Consequently, the organized Church is not simply a fold, into which the people of God are to be gathered, for their individual comfort and safety; nor yet a stronghold, a fortress, to which they may fly for protection; but it is, also, and mainly, an aggressive agency—a barracks of soldiers, and of the munitions of war, from whose gates invading armies are to issue, covered with the Gospel panoply, and go forth, conquering and to conquer. "Ye are the light of the world;" "ye are the salt of the earth; a city set on a hill, that can not be hid;" a light upon a candle-stick, that "giveth light to all that are in the house;" "leaven," to diffuse itself throughout the whole world. As the individual member of Christ's kingdom can not fold his hands and sit still, no more can the Church. The true mission, therefore, of the organized and visible Church is, to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. Accordingly, the Assembly seemed to regard the organization, and the setting in operation evangelical agencies for the diffusion of religious truth, and the spread of the Gospel amongst men, as its great work. The reconstruction of our Missionary and benevolent schemes engaged the early and earnest attention of the body. By common consent, the old system of "Boards" was abandoned. They never served any other purpose than that of being a kind of "upper room" in the Church—a sort of "Moses' seat," to which, in some cases, ambitious and vain men aspired, in order that their names, with their titles, might be published, from year to year, in the reports of the Boards, as the distinguished and titled gentlemen of the Church! They answered no good end, but were productive of evil. They were no honour, and became a disgrace, to religion. The Assembly did not discuss the propriety of readopting them. They were not even mentioned, with the view of reconstructing them. But it was, with entire unanimity, determined to prosecute

the evangelical work of the Church in the simplest and most effective manner possible. Therefore, as the Assembly could not, from the nature of the case, remain always in session, nor meet oftener than once a year, to do its own work, it was resolved to appoint, from year to year, small, efficient "Executive Committees" (*ad interim*) to represent and to do the work of the Assembly—consisting of nine ministers, or other members of the Church, besides a Secretary and Treasurer, all appointed annually by the Assembly. These Committees are to keep a faithful record of all their transactions, which, together with a report of their proceedings, they are to send up each year to the Assembly, for its review and control, as in the case of the Synodical records. The House was unanimous in the construction of these Committees, but not entirely so in their location, and in the manner in which their respective Secretaries should be appointed. There was no difference of opinion as to the location of the Executive Committees of Foreign and Domestic Missions; the seat of the former being Columbia, South Carolina, and the city of New Orleans that of the latter. But there was a decided difference of opinion as to the location of the Executive Committee of Publication. Richmond, Virginia, and Nashville, Tennessee, were both put in nomination. In favour of the former, the main considerations urged were: *First*, That from Richmond books and other publications could be shipped by sea, to the various centres of trade in the Confederacy, cheaper than they could be forwarded by railroad; and, *secondly*, that Richmond, being an older place than Nashville, and surrounded by a denser Presbyterian population, there would never be any difficulty in procuring an efficient and well officered Committee at that place. In favour of Nashville, it was urged: *First*, That the great design of publishing religious books, and other publications, was, that they might, in some degree, serve as a substitute for the living ministry, and, therefore, this evangelical agency should be

placed in the centre of the region where it was most needed. *Secondly*, That the marine insurance, and the greater length of time that would attend transportation by sea, would balance the increased expense of forwarding by rail. And, *thirdly*, and mainly, that Nashville was already a great publishing mart; that it was the seat of the Methodist Book Concern, South, and, also, the seat of the Baptist publishing operations; and that the experience of different trades has long since decided, that it is to the advantage of different crafts to be located in the same immediate vicinity, so as to draw to the same common centre common material, common skill, common capital, labour, competition, etc., etc. But, notwithstanding these potent reasons in favour of Nashville, the Assembly decided, erroneously, we think, in favour of Richmond, by a majority of sixteen votes. We still believe that it would be to the interest of that exceedingly important and responsible arm of the Church, to be yet located at Nashville. The Executive Committee of Education, which, we think, should be located at Richmond, was located at Memphis, Tennessee. And the work of Church extension was, for the present, committed to the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions.

But the manner in which the Secretaries of these several Committees should be appointed—whether by the Assembly, or the Committees themselves—gave occasion to one of the warmest discussions had on the floor of the House. The substance of what was said in favour of the former method was embodied, for the most part, in the remarks of the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, who said: "My convictions of the importance of this officer being elected by the Assembly, are very decided. I think, however, that we are likely to get into a misapprehension of the whole subject at the outset, by definitions. If properly stated, both Secretary and Treasurer would be members of the Committee, and just as much parts of that Committee

as any body else. I hold that there is not an office in the whole Presbyterian Church more responsible or important than the Secretaryship of these Committees—the responsibility of this office is almost too great to be laid on any one man. I know its trials and responsibilities, and such a work ought not to be committed to the hands of individuals. This office is fully as important as that of a Theological Professor in your Seminaries, and I ask you, would you commit the election of this officer to a Committee? Why, then, the election of a man to fill this equally important office? Besides, he ought to be called to this office by the voice of this whole Church, and, unless so called, I don't see how any one can take upon himself such an office. And I would state here, that, after having filled this office for seven or eight years, I came to the conclusion that I could not fill it any longer, because I felt that it was the duty of the Assembly to call me to it, and my duty not to serve unless so called. I think that the voice of the whole Church is necessary to call me to this very important place."

On the other side, in favour of the Committees electing their own officers, it was maintained: *First*, That, as the Committee was the representative of the Assembly, in fact, as it were a little Assembly (*ad interim*), to transact business in the name and behalf of the Assembly, whilst that body was not, and could not be, in session; that it should have, for the time being, certain specified rights and prerogatives of the larger body, at least so far as the election of its own officers were concerned. This, in the *second* place, would insure homogeneity to the Committee, which was a very important consideration in the operations of all executive bodies, since without this its parts would only clog and embarrass one another. In the *third* place, it would be an effectual safeguard against interruptions in the operations of the Committee from one meeting of the Assembly to the other, in case of the non-acceptance of

the Secretary elect, or of his resignation, failure of health, death, or other cause, since the Committee could immediately fill the vacancy. There would be a reasonable guarantee of permanency in the office so filled; as local considerations would induce the Assembly to appoint substantially the same Committee from year to year; and, accordingly, in view of the position being permanent, the best talent and ability available could be obtained by the Committee to fill such vacancy, which might not be the case, if the old Secretary was liable to be dropped, and a new one elected in his place every year. The next Assembly may be of a very different mind from this, and they may come up with their favorite. A king may arise that knows not Joseph—and a new Secretary may be put in office. And so it may, and in all probability will be, from year to year. This may lead to electioneering and log-rolling at every meeting of the Assembly, which will soon result in our best qualified men refusing to be candidates for the office—all which would be, in a great measure, avoided, by leaving the election to the Committees. Again: there is almost a necessity, said the Rev. Mr. Smylie, that the *salary* of the Secretary shall be fixed by the Committee, and this gives the Committee a power equal to a veto power upon the Assembly. Why not, then, make the Committee wholly responsible for the Secretary? Moreover, will it not be invidious to place over the Committee an officer, not of their own choosing, who shall be a kind of Archbishop over, but irresponsible to, them. Nay, will there not be a manifest awkwardness in the working, wheel within wheel, of two separate and independent agencies, neither responsible to the other? It will not do to force a Secretary upon a Committee; instead of facilitating, they would only impede, the operations of one another.

The Rev. R. McInnis "admitted that it might be a pleasant thing to be elected by the whole Church, but that it would

not be so pleasant for a brother nominated for the position of Secretary to have his claims and qualifications canvassed in open Assembly, and his defects or want of fitness for the place published to the world. He thought that it would be a very delicate thing, and that no one would feel free to canvass the qualifications of a nominee. This might be done by the Committee, and they, feeling the importance of an efficient Secretary, and being responsible to the Assembly for their fidelity, would be far more likely to make a wise and judicious choice; and if they are to be held, as they are, responsible to this body, they should have the privilege of selecting this officer. The Assembly might elect, as Secretary, a man of reputation, an able preacher, and yet he might be totally unfit for the duties of the office. It was not talents, but *peculiar* talents—a fitness for the work to be done—that was needed in a Secretary. The Assembly, he contended, could not judge of this as well as the Committee. What could such a body as this know, personally, of the qualifications of almost any one nominated? I need not answer. And, besides, there should be harmony between the Committee and Secretary in their feelings, views, and action. They must work cordially together. Yet this Assembly may not only elect an inefficient Secretary, but one between whom and the Committee there will be no harmony."

The Assembly, nevertheless, decided, by a small majority, adversely to the Committees being allowed to choose their own officers. The appointment, therefore, of the Secretaries and Treasurers of the several Executive Committees devolves, from year to year, upon the Assembly. Accordingly, they proceeded to elect the Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, D. D., Secretary of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, the Rev. John Leyburn, D. D., Secretary of the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions, the Rev. John H. Gray, D. D., Secretary of Education, and Rev. Wm. Brown, D. D., of Publication—all able and efficient men,

every way qualified to discharge faithfully the delicate and responsible duties committed to them.

The only other subject about which there was a decided difference of opinion, after discussion, related to the manner in which the Church should prosecute its work of Domestic Missions, as set forth in the sixth article of the report of the Standing Committee on that subject, of which the Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones was the Chairman. The debate was on the motion to strike out the article, which reads as follows:

"That Presbyteries be enjoined to raise funds, in the manner most approved by them, for the support of Domestic Missions, and be recommended, in conducting the work within their own bounds, to employ the agency of the Assembly's Committee for the purpose."

On this subject, there was more feeling evinced on the part of the speakers than any other. Indeed, it was the only debate in which there was any deep feeling manifested. The discussion was participated in by the Rev. Messrs. Adger, Thornwell, DuBose, Bocock, McFarland, Lacy, Moore, White, Welch, Pryor, Chapman, Gillespie, McInnis, Houston, Lyon, Stewart, Phillips, Loughridge, and others. The pivot on which the debate turned was, the latter part of the article, viz: And that the Presbyteries "be recommended, in conducting the work within their own bounds, to employ the agency of the Assembly's Committee for the purpose." In the course of the debate, Dr. Adger offered the following substitute for the article objected to, which was received with great favour by many, although the Assembly never reached a decisive vote upon it:

Whereas the work of Domestic Missions is a two-fold work, a work within the bounds of our established Presbyteries, and a work also on our frontiers, and in our feeble Presbyteries; and whereas the former ought to be conducted by every strong and able Presbytery for itself, it being their right and their duty to take care of themselves without

burdening the Assembly's Committee; and whereas the other part of the work of Domestic Missions must be devolved upon the central agency, and carried on through that Committee, by the coöperation of all the Presbyteries; this Assembly does, therefore, enjoin upon all the Presbyteries to aim, not only at overtaking their own destitutions, but also at carrying forward the general and frontier work, by means of the Committee now organized. There ought to be special and constant collections in every Presbytery in aid of this Committee's work, as herein defined. They are charged with the care of all our Missions on the frontier, and also with the duty of aiding all our weak Presbyteries, by means of the contributions of the strong. And it is hereby ordered that all the funds collected for Domestic Missions, whether dispensed by the Presbyteries themselves, or transmitted to the Committee, together with its Missionary operations, be fully and accurately reported by each Presbytery to the General Assembly, through this Committee, and that this report be made in time to be incorporated in the Committee's Report.

In favour of the motion to strike out, and to adopt the substitute, the substance of what was said was embraced in Dr. Adger's remarks, as follows: "There is a principle endangered by this article of the Committee, which many of us consider to be important, and for which we must be allowed to contend. We think those Presbyteries which are strong have not only the right, but it is their duty, to manage for themselves the work of Domestic Missions in their own bounds. At the same time, it is clearly their duty to contribute for its support in the weaker Presbyteries, and on the frontiers. We are very unwilling that you should enjoin it upon the able Presbyteries to do their own peculiar work through this central Committee; but we are equally anxious that you should enjoin upon those strong Presbyteries to take up special and constant collections for that Committee. We desire, not only that these older Presbyteries should send the Committee their *surplus* Domestic Missionary funds (as some of them have always done), but that they should regularly and specifically contribute to the cause, as it is to be carried on upon the frontiers and in the weak Presbyteries, just as they contribute for the cause of Foreign Missions. The true plan for

making Domestic Missions important in the eyes of the people is, to *objectify* it, holding it up before the Presbyteries as some thing *outside of themselves*, just as we do the work of Foreign Missions. Thus shall we *call forth* the charity of the Church. But, on the other hand, there are two objections to the old plan, of requiring the Presbyteries to cultivate their own peculiar field through the agency of this Committee. The one is, that it is bad policy, for people will naturally take a greater interest in their own work than in that of others; and the other is, that it will bring upon the Committee a vast amount of useless office-work, about matters which each Presbytery is more familiar with, and can manage better, than the Committee. Besides these things, it is well known that there was serious opposition excited against the old Board, because it sought to bring the Presbyteries under its power. It said hard things of those who did not carry on their own home-work through its agency. It endeavoured, at Lexington, to have the Assembly declare that every Church and Presbytery must *lose caste* which would not use the agency of the Board. This caused ill feeling and opposition. The Presbyteries thought the Board aimed to swallow them up, as the Government at Washington is trying to swallow up the States. Now, then, as we are beginning a new concern, is it wise to load it down with old difficulties and causes of trouble? Ought we not rather to aim at setting it up free of all causes of odium and prejudice? I speak of these things as a true and earnest friend of the cause of Domestic Missions in every one of our Presbyteries, and in the whole frontier country. We all desire to do that which is best for the cause; and, for one, I fear that if we adopt this sixth article we shall do that cause much harm. Still further: it came to be the settled conviction of many of the best and wisest friends of the old Board (our respected brother, Dr. C. C. Jones, once Secretary of the Board, included), that there is naturally a constant tendency in the churches and Presby-

teries which receive such aid to hang on too long in dependence upon the central Committee. Many churches, Dr. Jones found, when he entered on the office of Secretary, had been sucking the paps of the old Board for twenty years, and could not possibly be shaken off. Now, our paper strikes at this evil. We desire to encourage self-reliance in the Presbyteries. It is the duty of every Presbytery, as it is of every church, to do its own work, if it possibly can. And in no other way can the whole Church ever be brought up to the right standard of action in this matter, until the principle is adopted, and acted on, that each Session and Presbytery must take care of its own field, and must, also, send forth their energies to the weak and the needy who are beyond."

In opposition to striking out, it was argued that the Church was a unit—that the General Assembly, *mutatis mutandis*, was only a big Presbytery, and that the Presbytery was a little General Assembly—that each one of the several Executive Committees represented the Church—the whole Church—that they were, as it were, miniature Assemblies (*ad interim*), to do the work of the Assembly proper; and, that, therefore, the very genius and spirit of our Church polity required unity of action in all our schemes*—that, as the whole Church acted, at least, *pro*

* With reference to the genius and spirit of our polity, it may be observed that, undoubtedly, the principle pervades our whole Constitution, that the higher Courts are not to engage in doing any thing which the Courts below can do as well. The higher Courts have, essentially, all the powers which belong to any of the lower Courts; but the Constitution provides that whatever the lower Courts can themselves do perfectly well, shall be done by them, and that only that which they can not so well attend to, shall devolve upon the Courts above. Thus, the Session takes the oversight of the affairs of its own church, and the Presbytery does not meddle with those matters, except in the way of review. And thus the Synod leaves each Presbytery to review the proceedings of its own Sessions, and to examine, license, ordain, judge, and depose its own Ministers, and, also, to unite or divide congregations, at the request of the people,

forma, through the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, and through the Executive Committee of Publication, so, in like manner, there was a consistency and a beauty in carrying out the same principle through all our benevolent enterprises and general schemes of Christian charity—that there was a manifest incongruity in appointing an Executive Committee to do a certain work, and then enjoining it upon the Presbyteries to do the same work, wholly independent of the Committee. Moreover, even suppose that the strong Presbyteries should do their own work, in fact, there was no good reason why they should not use the Committee as the channel of their operations, which would require only the writing of a few letters, the

---

etc.; the Synod does not review or control Sessions, except through Presbyteries. Just so the General Assembly reviews the records and proceedings of the Synods, and not, directly, of the Presbyteries, and takes the oversight of what concerns the whole Church. The principle is embodied in the eighth paragraph of Section II. of the Book of Discipline, thus: "References are generally to be carried to the judicatory immediately superior." No burden shall be laid on the higher Court, which the Court below it can as well bear.

The application is plain. When we come to equip the Church for her work of propagating the faith, we must devolve upon the General Assembly, acting through its Executive Committee, the work of Foreign Missions and of Publication; because, clearly, no Presbytery or Synod could so well undertake that work. We must, also, devolve upon the Assembly, in some of their aspects, the work of Education and Domestic Missions: so far, for example, as concerns the great South-West—the frontier field, which our Church must enter and cultivate for the Lord—that is for the General Assembly, just as necessarily as is Foreign Missions. And surely that is a work large enough, and responsible enough, to rouse the energies of any Committee that rightly conceives of it. So, also, the General Assembly is the proper body to be an organ for *communicating* between all the strong and all the weak Presbyteries. But, surely, on the other hand, it is not in the spirit of the Constitution to impose on the Assembly, through its Committee, the Domestic Missionary work within the bounds of each particular Presbytery, wherever that Presbytery is able itself to carry it forward. If the domestic work in each Presbytery must be devolved on the Assembly, shall the work, also, of each Session be devolved upon it?—EDS. S. P. R.

filling up and signing of a few commissions, and the making up of a brief report to be sent to the Assembly's Committee once a year. This would accord, at least, with our *theory* of unity, and present, every year, a succinct view of the benevolent operations of the whole Church, for the encouragement and gratification of all its members.

Mr. Stewart said: "I see no reason why the Presbyteries should object to communicating through the Committees. I am deeply convinced that a fatal stroke will be given to this Committee, if you allow this. It will make this Committee a *one-horse concern.* But my principal objection is, it dissolves the bond of union between the Presbyteries and this Committee; and this is vital to the responsibility and effectiveness of this scheme. As a friend of it, I do protest, most earnestly, against this great discrimination between it and the others."

Dr. White said: "But if it goes to the ears of the Presbyteries, that you have stricken out this resolution, four-fifths of the Presbyteries will begin this work for themselves, and where will the funds come from to support this Committee? Then, how will this Committee act efficiently, even on the frontiers of the Church? The Committee will become *contemptible.* But, if the Presbyteries are allowed to sustain the work in their own bounds, many churches, who might sustain themselves, will be left to linger on the alms of the Church, because the Presbyteries can't refuse their aid when it is asked of them, whereas the Committee would have no undue bias in favour of them."

Professor Phillips said: "It is inconsistent to establish an agency, and then decline to recommend it to the Presbyteries. What the agency of this Committee is, has not yet been settled. If a Presbytery is an established and rich Presbytery, is it to be independent, while the weak Presbyteries must work through the Committee?"

Dr. Thornwell said: "I do not intend to detain the Assembly long, but there are a few things which I feel bound to utter. It is said this article leaves the Presbyteries as absolutely at liberty as before—it does not interfere with their rights, their present modes of operation—it leaves them just where they stand now. Then, what is gained by the article? If these rights are to be guaranteed by the resolution, then let them be clearly acknowledged, as in Dr. Adger's paper. You say, that to you, they are clearly expressed in that article; in other words, that you will guarantee our rights, but yet you refuse to put them down in black and white.

"In this debate, two things that ought to be kept distinct, are put together; the grandeur of the *Committee*, and the grandeur of the *work*. If, you say—if the Presbyteries supply the destitutions in their own limits, it detracts from the grandeur of the Committee! Oh! my brethren, *if the work be done*, is not that all we have in view? It is our aim, not to promote the grandeur of the Committee, but to promote the cause of God. It is our aim to supply the waste places—to evangelize our own destitutions—to build up the walls of Jerusalem—to carry forward the glorious Gospel. Brethren seem frankly to admit that, if the Presbyteries are allowed this privilege, *the work will be done*, but *the Committee's glory* will suffer. I care nothing for the glory of the Committee, as long as I detract nothing from the glory of God and the Church. The course which these brethren pursue, is most extraordinary. They admit that the work will be done, and done effectually. Is not the work the great matter? Why, then, scramble over the question *how it is done?*

"So much for the argument on the other side. They talk about a liberty of the Presbyteries, which their zeal for this article shows that they do not fairly and squarely acknowledge; because Dr. Adger's resolution adds nothing to that liberty. We believe the resolution of the report

takes some thing away, and if our brethren persist that it takes away nothing, then why not remove the obnoxious language?

"As to Dr. Adger's paper, a single word. The work of Domestic Missions is, clearly—*first*, a work falling on the Presbyteries within their own bounds—and, *secondly*, a work which transcends the power of feeble Presbyteries, and which extends to our frontier. In this joint work, all Presbyteries, whether old or young, rich or poor, should put their shoulders to the wheel to carry it forward. We do not give a single Presbytery the power of saying 'I will not aid.' This Committee shall be the organ of communication with the waste places, with the vacancies on our frontier, and also between the strong and the weak Presbyteries. Is not that work enough? Must you allow the Committee to go into an old Presbytery and say: 'Here is A. B., whom you have settled as a Pastor, with a salary of so much, but we will not allow him to work, unless you allow us to call your settled Pastor our Missionary, so that the Assembly may know that he works under our commission;' thus, you make him have a double commission—from the Presbytery, as a *Pastor*, and from the Committee, as a Missionary. We want no such complicated work, no such wheel within a wheel, as that.

"We have thus far acted wisely, Moderator; we have acted judiciously, and so as to gain the commendation of God and our Church, in the organization of every other Committee. I want the Assembly to be unanimous on the organization of this Committee, which is destined to achieve the most important work. But, I do solemnly assure brethren that, if they pass that resolution, they will give a fatal blow to this Committee, at its very inception. The Synods and Presbyteries will be alienated from it; and there are liberal churches, that have given with a princely hand, that will be alienated from it. Is it wise, is it judicious, at the inauguration of such a project, to put it in

opposition to the feelings of any portion of our Church? If you do pass that resolution, you do violate the consciences of some in this Assembly, and the deep and settled convictions of some of our largest ecclesiastical bodies—of some of our Synods, as well as Presbyteries. I beg you earnestly to consider before you do this.

"Every thing here has been in such perfect harmony, we have felt the presence of God so clearly, that, if the matter is to be a disputed question, I had rather adjourn than to press it now. Our Church, now, requires every shoulder to be put to the wheel. Let us stand shoulder to shoulder. Whatever divides us, let us give to the winds."

Dr. White then spoke, to the effect that, as no *principle* was involved in yielding what had been advocated by the majority of the Assembly, that in order to secure harmony in all our proceedings, he hoped that the objectionable article would be stricken out, which was accordingly done; after which, on motion of Judge Forward, the various Presbyteries were ordered to send up to the Executive Committee of Missions an annual report of their Missionary operations within their respective bounds. Thus ended one of the most earnest and exciting discussions had on the floor of the Assembly.

After the complete organization of the several Executive Committees, it still remained to devise some feasible plan for their election by the Assembly. To accomplish this, Dr. Thornwell offered the following resolution, viz:

Resolved, That the Chairmen of the Standing Committees on Foreign and Domestic Missions, Education, Publication, and Church Extension, be appointed a Joint Committee, to report a scheme for regulating the method of electing the Executive Committees.

In obedience to this resolution, the following standing rules were reported and adopted, viz:

I. "The Assembly's Standing Committees shall, on making their respective reports, present nominations for

the members and officers for their respective Executive Committees for the ensuing year.

II. "The presentation of their respective nominations shall not preclude any additional nominations which the Assembly may choose to make.

III. "The election of said Committees shall not take place until at least one day after the nominations are made.

IV. "In all cases, a majority of the voters of the Assembly shall be necessary to an election."

The concluding part of the discussion, relative to Domestic Missions, was thrillingly interesting. The last article of the amended report of the Committee reads as follows:

IV. That the great field of Missionary operations among our colored population falls more immediately under the care of the Committee on Domestic Missions, and that Committee be urged to give it serious and constant attention, and the Presbyteries to coöperate with the Committee, in securing Pastors and Missionaries for this field.

The Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones, of Georgia, than whom no Minister of the Assembly wielded a greater moral influence, or was more revered by that body, was requested, by the unanimous voice of the Assembly, to deliver an address on the religious instruction of the slaves, in which work he himself had attained his eminent and deserved distinction. Accordingly, the evening session of the sixth day was devoted to the subject, when Dr. Jones delivered a faithful and powerful address on this emphatically great subject. "These people," said he, "were sent here from barbarism, from the kraals of Africa, to learn here a Saviour's love. Thousands, in these past two hundred years, have reached the Celestial City, to praise God for his wonderful providences. These people have always been with us; they teach us to walk, to talk; they wait about us, and labour for us; they follow us through life; they linger about us till death. Are they not nigh unto us? Are they the brutes that perish? Do we leave them to die unlamented? Every

body of them covers an immortal soul. They are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. They are joint heirs with us to immortality," etc. The Assembly, by resolution, requested Dr. Jones to prepare and publish the aforesaid address, in the form of a tract, for general circulation.

There was no subject that seemed to excite a more intense interest than that of evangelizing and elevating the black race in the midst of us. There was a deep and abiding impression resting upon the minds of all the brethren, that one of the great ends, if not the great mission, to be accomplished by our separate and independent existence, both as a Church and a State, was the conservation of negro slavery, and the more perfect developement and elevation of the African race amongst us—a noble and philanthropic consummation, which, owing to irremediable obstacles, never could have been successfully accomplished in our old relations, either of Church or State. But now, severed by the manifest interposition of the Almighty's holy and wise providence, there is nothing to hinder us from elevating negro slavery up to the Bible standard, which, when done, we can defend it against the argument, the sophistry, and the railing accusation of the whole world! Such was the interest felt on this, now the greatest of all subjects, that a Select Committee was appointed to elaborate and carefully prepare a manifesto, to be laid before the next General Assembly, for their adoption, in the form of a Pastoral Letter, on the subject of slavery, and the religious instruction of slaves, addressed to all the Ministers and all the members of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.

The report on Systematic Benevolence, by Dr. Adger, was able and comprehensive, setting forth, in a clear and felicitous light, the true views on that great and important subject—important on two accounts: *first*, as to its influence upon the spread of the Gospel amongst men; and, *secondly*, in its bearing upon the personal piety and growth

in grace of the individual Christian. Giving is a part of worship—it is Faith acting. Works without prayer, is Atheism; and prayer without works, is presumption—prayer for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, without giving, as the Lord has prospered us, or without exerting ourselves to effect the object of our prayer, is mockery. The Assembly ordered that the report should be printed by the Publication Committee, for general circulation.

Dr. Leland, the Chairman of the Committee on the Narrative, presented to the Assembly a very instructive and valuable paper; which, in these times of darkness and trial, in both Church and State, was exceedingly comforting, and well calculated to revive and strengthen the drooping hopes of the people of God.

The Rev. Peyton Harrison, Chairman of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, reported the following, and it was adopted, viz: "The Synods of Virginia and North Carolina request that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America will assume the same review and control over the Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia, which the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States heretofore exercised, according to the plan of the Seminary, and that the Seminary shall be called 'The Union Theological Seminary of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America,' and the Board of Directors shall report annually to the Assembly."

The following named gentlemen, in the several States, were appointed Trustees of the General Assembly, viz: In the State of Alabama—R. M. Patten and John Whiting. In Georgia—James B. Walker. In South Carolina—T. C. Perrin and Robert Adger. In North Carolina—J. H. Lindsay. In Virginia—S. McCorkle. In Mississippi—Thomas Henderson. In Tennessee—D. M. Kennedy, William T. Fleming, and W. S. Eakin. In Louisiana—B. M. Palmer,

M. Greenwood, William P. Campbell, and Joseph A. Maybin.

The following RESOLUTIONS were, at different times, passed by the Assembly, and became part of its regular proceedings, viz:

1. By Dr. Thornwell: "That it be submitted to the Presbyteries, to make the following provisions in regard to the Constitution. All changes in the Confession of Faith, or the Catechisms, in order to be valid, must be proposed by three-fourths of one Assembly, and confirmed by three-fourths of the two succeeding Assemblies. And all changes in the other books that make up the Constitution, must be proposed by two-thirds of one Assembly, and ratified by a majority of the next Assembly." This was referred to the next Assembly.

2. By Dr. Bailey: "That the General Assembly contemplates, with the highest satisfaction, the proposed organization of a National Bible Society for the Confederate States of America, and for which a meeting or Convention is proposed to be held in the city of Augusta, on the third Wednesday of March next. And we take the present suitable occasion to recommend that a work so important may receive the hearty and liberal support of all our people, Presbyteries and Churches."

3. By Dr. Bocock: "That this General Assembly heartily approves of that clause in the Constitntion of the Confederate States, which forbids the Congress to enact any law in regard to a religious establishment, and that it understands that prohibition equally to restrain the Executive from preferring in the public service one branch of the Church above another."

4. By Dr. Thornwell: "That the Trustees of the General Assembly, whenever funds, by way of gift, devise, or bequest, come to their hands, for either of the Assembly's established Committees, be directed to pay over said funds to the Treasurer of the Executive Committee which is

designated in the gift, devise, or bequest; and the release of the Treasurer of said Executive Committee, to the Treasurer of the Trustees, shall be sufficient to serve as a discharge for the Trustees."

The following Committees were appointed to act in the interval, and to report to the next General Assembly, viz:

I. To memorialize Congress, in compliance with the following resolution offered by the Rev. R. McInnis, viz: "That a Committee be appointed and instructed to take the proper steps to secure a legal title to all property within the Confederate States to which, in their judgment, the Presbyterian Church in these States possess an equitable claim."

Wm. P. Webb, of Alabama, Thomas C. Perrin, and Chancellor Job Johnston, of South Carolina, J. G. Shepherd, of North Carolina, W. L. Mitchell, of Georgia, and W. F. C. Gregory, of Virginia, were appointed that Committee.

II. Four several Committees were appointed to secure charters for the General Assembly in the States of Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi and Virginia, viz: For Tennessee—Alfred Robb, Jackson B. White, A. W. Putnam, and B. M. Estes. For Louisiana—James N. Lee, T. Allen Clarke, and B. M. Palmer. For Mississippi—J. W. C. Watson, Henry T. Ellett, J. W. Clapp, and T. J. Wharton. For Virginia—W. F. C. Gregory, R. D. Montague, A. D. Dickinson, and J. D. Armstrong.

III. On revision of the Book of Discipline, the Rev. John S. Wilson, D. D., offered the following paper, which was adopted, viz:

Whereas it will now become necessary, in the altered relations of our Church, to publish a new edition of the Confession of Faith, with such amendments as shall conform it to the style and title of the Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States of America; and whereas necessity has already been felt for the revision of the Book of Discipline, and it is highly proper that such revision should be made before another edition of the book is printed; therefore, be it

Resolved, That a Committee be now appointed, to whom shall be referred the work of revising the Book of Discipline and Form of Government; and that the said Committee be required to report at the next session of the General Assembly.

Whereupon a Committee of nine was appointed, consisting of Drs. J. H. Thornwell, R. L. Dabney, B. M. Smith, J. B. Adger, and E. T. Baird, Ministers; with Ruling Elders W. P. Webb, T. C. Perrin, W. L. Mitchell, and Job Johnston. To this Committee, Judge Shepherd was afterwards added, on motion of Dr. Thornwell.

IV. To prepare an address on the subject of slavery, and the religious instruction of slaves, in the form of a Pastoral Letter, addressed to all the Ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, to be reported to the next General Assembly, for their adoption. This Committee consists of Rev. James A. Lyon, D. D., Rev. Theodoric Pryor, D. D., and Rev. C. C. Jones, D. D.

V. On Psalmody. It was universally conceded that our Church Psalmody stood greatly in need of revision—that it could be much improved by a vigorous process of lopping off, condensing, expunging, shortening, adding some, and leaving out a great deal—(at least one-half)—changing antiquated phrases and forms of expression for terms in common use, etc., etc. To perform this exceedingly delicate and important work, a Committee was appointed, consisting of the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D.,—(appointed Chairman by the Assembly)—Rev. T. V. Moore, D. D., Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D., Rev. J. B. Stratton, D. D., and Rev. John W. Pratt.

The work of the Assembly thus being complete, the Rev. Dr. McMullen arose and said: "Brethren, the Lord has blessed us in an extraordinary degree. The unanimity and cordiality with which every thing has been transacted, seems to me very remarkable, and it would be to me very gratifying if we could spend an hour this evening in devo-

tional exercises—it would be a delightful closing of this Assembly."

The suggestion was adopted, and the Assembly came together at half-past seven o'clock in the evening, and spent a season in devotional exercises.

After which, Dr. Palmer, the Moderator, said: "My brethren, the fulness of this Assembly, drawn from all parts of our extended Confederacy, during a season of extraordinary peril and darkness, is sufficient proof that all our hearts were impressed with the importance of this convocation. The discussions through which we have passed during the Sessions of this Assembly, have opened the fundamental principles of our Government, and, to some extent, of our Faith. And, that we have been able to set this Church forward fully equipped, and, in doing so, to uncover all those principles, and to do it almost without a jar, is a sufficient proof that we have enjoyed the presence of God's blessed Spirit. The fact, too, that we have been led to open our hearts towards our brethren of the great Presbyterian family, who are not gathered under the same roof with ourselves—opening in the near future the prospect of reunion with those of like faith with ourselves—is an additional proof that our hearts have been moved by the Spirit of Grace. And now we are to part; and as we extend the hand of parting, there will be scarcely an eye that will not moisten—scarcely a heart that will not throb. We are made to feel, as we return to our several homes, that it has been, indeed, a privilege to come up here, as to a Mount of Ordinances. Our language will be the language of Peter on the Mount: 'Lord, it is good for us to be here.'"

Dr. Pryor—"I rise, Moderator, to move that this Assembly be now dissolved. *We part to meet no more in this world.* But it is pleasant to feel that there is a land where we shall meet again—

"There, on a green and flowery mount,
Our happy souls shall meet,
And with transporting joy recount
The labours of our feet."

The three hundred and forty-second hymn was then sung, and, after a prayer and benediction by the Moderator, the Assembly was declared dissolved; and another Assembly, appointed in like manner, ordered to meet in the city of Memphis, Tennessee, at eleven o'clock, A. M., in the First Presbyterian Church, on the first Thursday of May, A. D. 1862.

P. S.—There was another very important subject that engaged the attention, not of the Assembly, as such, but of many of its leading members, which, though we could not properly notice it in the review of the proceedings of the Assembly, yet will not be out of place in a postscript. We refer to the *Educational Meeting*, that took place on Friday evening of the second week.

Many individuals have, for a long time past, felt that our Church, which has hitherto been the standard-bearer in the great work of education, in its highest forms, was not keeping pace with the progress of science, and was not maintaining her high position, as heretofore, as the chief educator of the land. Not that she was actually falling back from her old stand-point, but that she was *standing still*, whilst science, and art, and knowledge, were going forward; and other denominations were, in a praiseworthy manner, coming close up in her rear, and bidding fair soon to outstrip us, if we should not bestir ourselves, and start anew in the career in which we have, in times past, gained so much distinction. Such thoughts kindled a fire that began to burn in the breasts of some brethren in the South-West. They began, after a while, modestly to communicate with one another, and brought up their zeal on the subject to the General Assembly. Accordingly, there was a little,

timid meeting, of some half-dozen, held one night in the study of the Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D. The result was, that a larger meeting, embracing some fifteen or more, was held the next evening in the Lecture Room. And the result of that was, the calling of a *convention* of all the members, on the Friday evening mentioned, when the whole subject was discussed by Drs. Waddel, Palmer, Thornwell, Adger, Foote, and others, and an impulse given to the cause, exceeding the most sanguine expectations of its friends.

Every thing must have a beginning. And a great scheme like this must creep before it walks. It can not be accomplished in a day, nor a year. But if a great Confederate University, such as is contemplated, fully up to the age and the progress of human knowledge, can be successfully accomplished in the present generation of the Southern Presbyterians, they will have done a great work, and marked the age in which they lived. All that is wanting to accomplish this grand enterprise, is sufficient interest and confidence in the Church and the friends of education, after which there will be no lack of means. To excite this interest, and create this confidence, will require some time and effort. This concentric wave, small in its beginning, must roll out, and extend to our Synods, and Presbyteries, and Sessions, and Pastors, and people! All must become interested. All must have faith and confidence in the success of the noble scheme, and then the work will be easy. Rich men are liberal when they believe their money will not be thrown away on visionary schemes, but will accomplish that for which it was given. Two millions can be raised easier, with confidence, than twenty thousand without it.

The following resolution was offered by Dr. Palmer, and unanimously adopted by the meeting, over which the Hon. Judge William A. Forward, of Florida, presided as Chairman, viz:

Resolved, That a Committee of ten be appointed, to draft a plan for the establishment of an Institution of the highest order, within the Confederate States; which Committee shall report to a Convention of the friends of Education, to be held at the city of Memphis, on the day preceding the meeting of the next General Assembly.

In response to this resolution, the following Committee was appointed by the Chair (Dr. Palmer nominating, and Dr. Waddel seconding, the Chairman), viz: James A. Lyon, D. D., B. M. Palmer, D. D., J. H. Thornwell, D. D., John N. Waddel, D. D., Theodoric Pryor, D. D., R. B. White, D. D., Prof. W. D. Moore, Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., R. B. McMullen, D. D., R. Hett Chapman, D. D.

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS,

AT

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XV.

COLUMBIA, S. C.:
STEAM-POWER PRESS OF C. P. PELHAM.

1863.

Ar

I

II

IV

V

VI

I

II

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

NUMBER I.

ARTICLE — PAGE

I.—PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORK OF FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign Missions, Columbia, S. C., - - 1

II.—THE LAW OF THE SABBATH, IN ITS BEARING UPON NATIONAL PROSPERITY. By the Rev. EDWARD MARTIN, Nottoway C. H., Va., - - - - - - - - 23

III.—THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN THE CLASSICS. By the Rev. J. H. BOCOCK, D. D., Appomattox C. H., Va., - - - 30

IV.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1862. By the Rev. JOSEPH R. WILSON, D. D., Augusta, Ga., - - - - - 52

V.—HYMN-BOOK MAKING. By the Rev. A. F. DICKSON, Orangeburg C. H., S. C., - - - - - - - - - - 61

VI.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ABBEVILLE DISTRICT, S. C. By M. E. D., - - - - 78

VII.—MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Prof. Eccl. Hist. and Church Polity, Columbia, S. C., - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 94

NUMBER II.

I.—DELITZSCH ON GENESIS. By the Rev. GEORGE HOWE, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - - - - - - - 161

II.—SUPERIORITY OF THE GREEKS IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS. By the Rev. Prof. E. F. ROCKWELL, Davidson College, N. C., - - - - - - - - - - 198

ARTICLE PAGE

III.—THE RELATIONS OF LANGUAGE. By the Rev. R. C. KETCHUM, Clarkesville, Ga., - - - - - - - - - - 205

IV.—THE PURITANS. By the Rev. JOSEPH M. ATKINSON, Raleigh, N. C., - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 230

V.—LIFE, CHARACTER, AND GENIUS OF THE LATE REV. JAMES H. THORNWELL, D. D., LL. D. (With a Portrait.) By the Rev. B. M. PALMER, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 255

NUMBER III.

I.—ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART. By JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., Professor of Natural Science, South Carolina College, - - - - - - - - - 311

II.—THE PEOPLE AND LANGUAGES OF WESTERN AFRICA. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign Missions, Columbia, S. C., - - - 349

III.—LETTER TO THE REV. DR. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE. By the Rev. JOHN H. BOCOCK, D. D., Appomattox C. H., Va., - - - - - - - - - - 372

IV.—REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. A. W. MILLER, Petersburg, Va., - - - - 405

V.—PSALMODY AND THE UNION. By the Rev. EDMUND L. PATTON, President of Erskine College, S. C., - 448

NUMBER IV.

I.—THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED. By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - - 479

II.—ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART. (*Concluded.*) By JOSEPH LECONTE, M. D., Professor of Natural Science, South Carolina College, - - - - - - - - - 515

III.—GEOLOGY AND ITS ASSAILANTS, - - - - - - - - - 549

IV.—RELIGION AND POLITICS. By the Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - - - - - - - - - 569

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XV.—NO. 1.

JULY, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE WORK OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

AN ADDRESS TO CANDIDATES FOR THE MINISTRY.

I ask your attention, my respected young brethren, to the subject of personal engagement in the work of Foreign Missions. I have no apology to offer, and I presume you have none to ask, for claiming your attention to a matter of such unquestionable importance. It may be taken for granted, that in taking the necessary steps for fitting yourselves for the work of the ministry, you have already settled the question of your call to this sacred office. It is to be hoped that, in adopting this conclusion, you were guided by the Holy Ghost; and that the only object you had then, and the only desire you have now, in seeking this office, is to honor your Redeemer in the salvation of your fellow-men.

The next question which will naturally occupy your thoughts, and especially of those of you who are approaching the close of your studies, is, where you are to exercise those ministerial functions for which you are now fitting

yourselves. This inquiry, if prompted by right motives, and conducted in the proper way, brings you at once face to face with the question, whether you are to labor in your native land, or are to become Foreign Missionaries—this primary question having been settled, either way, others, of a subordinate nature, will present themselves for consideration, but with these we shall have nothing to do at present. Yet it is a matter of momentous importance to your happiness, your usefulness, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, that the main question be settled in accordance with the Divine will.

In the discussion of the subject before us, it is not our purpose to hold the balance between the claims of the home and the foreign fields, but to place the latter, the foreign work, in its true and proper position; and we wish it to be distinctly borne in mind, throughout all the remarks we shall offer, that constant reference is had to the existing difference in the actual condition of the two fields; in other words, that one is a Christian land, where the Gospel is habitually dispensed, and where all have some knowledge of the Christian salvation, whilst the other is wholly without the light of the Gospel, and where none have any knowledge of this salvation whatever.

Before proceeding to the main points of our discussion, it is necessary to notice one or two false assumptions that have connected themselves with the subject.

One of these relates to the order in which the different nations of the earth are to be evangelized. No question is raised in relation to the fact that all are to be brought to the knowledge of the Saviour. The Gospel, according to the Divine command, is to be preached in all the world, and to every creature, and through this means all the peoples, and kindreds, and tongues among men are to be brought under the dominion of the Lord Jesus. The field to be cultivated is the world—the whole world. But by what process, or according to what order, is this to be

brought about? According to the theory we have under consideration, our own country is to be thoroughly evangelized first; after that, those nations which stand next in the scale of civilization; and, last of all, the more degraded Pagan nations of the earth. The more popular form of the argument is, that our own countrymen must be converted before we can undertake any thing of importance for the rest of the world; and the reason alleged in support of this view is, that when our own country is thoroughly evangelized, and all her resources are consecrated to the Lord, we shall be enabled to prosecute the foreign work with a more vigorous and powerful arm. But the question arises, who authorized this particular mode of procedure? Not the Lord Jesus; for He commanded His Gospel to be preached in every nation, and to every creature, irrespective of any such plan. Not the Holy Ghost; for He has placed the seal of His approbation to the truth, wherever it has been proclaimed. Not the Apostles or primitive Christians; for they went every where, making known the unsearchable riches of Christ. Not the providence of God; for that, at the present moment, is laying open all the heathen nations of the earth to the influences of the Gospel. The theory betrays a human origin, and, on this account alone, ought to be regarded with distrust. Against it there lie two very serious objections. One of these is, that it presumes to understand the unrevealed purposes of Almighty God, and lays down a programme, if we may so speak, by which He is to proceed in the conversion of the nations to Himself. But who knows that it has been decided in the councils of Heaven that our own country is to be first among all the nations of the earth to be fully and completely evangelized? Who knows that this great favor may not be reserved for India, for China, or for poor, miserable, degraded Africa? Would it be any novelty in the economy of Divine grace, if the first should be last, or the last first? But an equally serious objection is, that it entirely misapprehends

the nature and functions of the Christian ministry. When we speak of evangelizing this or that nation, according to a certain order, it implies that the work of conversion belongs to men; whereas, it is peculiarly and exclusively the office of the Holy Ghost. Our work (and we can not keep this too distinctly before the mind) is to spread the knowledge of the truth among men, leaving it for the Holy Ghost to make it effectual to their salvation, and bring about the evangelization of the different nations, according to His own plan and order.

The other false assumption has reference to our relation to the work. It is a very common idea, especially among young men about to enter the ministry, that they are to labor in their native land, as a matter of course, unless they have some special call to go abroad. It is not easy to account for the prevalence of this idea, unless it be found in the fact that the great body, even of intelligent Christian men, have no proper appreciation of the claims of the Foreign Missionary cause. If any thing is to be taken for granted at all, the converse of this general proposition is, perhaps, nearer the truth. When we remember that the command of the Saviour, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, remains, even to the present day, substantially unfulfilled; when we call to mind the fact that all in our own country, or very nearly all, have some knowledge of the Christian salvation, and would know what to do to be saved, if they were so disposed; and when we couple with this the still further fact, that the heathen are entirely without this knowledge, and would not know what to do, even if they felt the most intense desire to be saved, we can hardly see how any young man, possessing the necessary qualifications to be a Foreign Missionary, can reconcile it with his conscience to remain at home, without some plain indication of Providence that it is his duty to do so. The most natural course is to go where the principal work is to be done; where the necessities of poor human nature are the

greatest; and where the Saviour may be most signally honored, because requiring on the part of his followers greater hardships and self-denials.

OBSTACLES IN THE WAY OF ENGAGING IN THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY WORK.

Some of these are weighty and insurmountable, whilst others are erroneously regarded as such. We shall bring under review a few of the leading ones of either class, commencing with those that are not insuperable. Among these may be mentioned:

(1.) That the *want of a call* to this particular work is often alleged as a reason for not engaging in it. But why, it may be asked, is a more special call needed for the foreign than the home field? Both are included in the same great commission, and both are under the same divine supervision. The only difference in a call from these two fields is, that in one case it proceeds from the particular church or congregation where the individual is expected to labor, whilst in the other it must be presented through the agency appointed by the Church, in her collective capacity, to represent the heathen. Any undue stress laid upon a call coming directly from the people, is not only a slight to the authority of the Church, as expressed by her highest judicatory, but is an act of injustice to the heathen, inasmuch as it is out of the question for them to present a call on their own behalf. But, in either case, we ought to know that the call is in accordance with the Divine will. But how can this be ascertained? So far as the foreign work is concerned, we answer, in no other way than by reference to His will in relation to the evangelization of these nations; and His will can be inferred only from His word, His Spirit, and His providence. What, then, is the testimony of His word? "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Again: where has this

Gospel been preached among any of these nations, whether in the days of the Apostles or subsequently, that it has not been sealed upon the hearts of men by the Holy Ghost? Furthermore, has not the providence of God been specially active, for years past, in removing all the outward obstacles to the introduction of the Gospel among these nations? Here, then, is a call endorsed by the three-fold authority of God's word, Spirit, and providence. If you can not read your commission to become Foreign Missionaries in all this (provided you have the necessary qualifications for the work), I do not know where you are to go to get more explicit instructions.

(2.) *Personal preference* ought to have very little weight in settling a question of so much importance. When you made choice of the calling of the ministry, if you acted from right motives, and with an intelligent view of its duties and obligations, you made an entire surrender of yourselves to the service of the Lord Jesus, and you have not now any right to choose where you are to go, or what duties you are to perform, but you are to be governed by the calls and indications of His providence. The calling of a soldier furnishes an analogous case. When he enlists for the defence of his country, he places himself at the direction of his commanding officer, and obeys every command, and performs every duty assigned him, irrespective of his personal wishes, or of the dangers involved in the performance of that duty. So it should be with the Christian soldier. His only rule of conduct should be the will of his great Captain, and at His bidding he should be ready to go to the utmost ends of the earth, and even lay down his life, if that were required.

(3.) Nearly allied to this are the wishes and preferences of your personal friends and relatives. If they oppose your going on a Foreign Mission, from what you know to be honest and conscientious convictions of your want of adaptedness to the work, their objections deserve your most

serious consideration. Your friends may have a more correct view of your character and adaptation to such an undertaking than you have yourselves, and their counsels, therefore, ought not to be slighted. If, on the other hand, you have reason to believe that their opposition arises mainly from a selfish unwillingness to part with you, or from a want of a proper appreciation of the claims of the Foreign Missionary cause, it ought to have no influence whatever upon your final decision. The Saviour admits of no rivalry with His claims. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." He that would be a sincere and consistent disciple, must take up his cross and follow Him through good and through evil report.

(4.) The want of *personal holiness* is frequently, but very improperly, assigned as a reason for not engaging in this work. No one can help feeling the sincerest respect for scruples of this kind, when they arise, as they often do, from a deep sense of personal unworthiness to engage in so holy a cause. But the same objection would lie against entering upon the work of the ministry at all. In neither case can we reasonably expect the blessing of God to attend our labors, unless we cultivate a spirit of personal piety, and He is as ready to grant us the necessary grace for the one as the other. The proper course, therefore, for one who feels his insufficiency is, not to turn away from the work, but to seek the grace necessary to render him an effective laborer; and there is no surer way, perhaps, of reaching this desired attainment, than by casting one's self upon the Lord Jesus, to go, if need be, to the remotest ends of the earth, relying solely upon His promised aid to help and sustain in every possible emergency.

(5.) The claims of patriotism do not exonerate us, as ministers of Jesus Christ, from going to the heathen. Those claims, we readily admit, especially in circumstances like

the present, are very strong; and in no case ought they to be treated lightly. Still, however, we must not forget that the claims of Christianity are paramount to those of patriotism. The Master to whom we profess fealty, and to whose services we have solemnly consecrated all our energies, includes within His realms the whole race of man, and the work He has expressly assigned His ministers is to proclaim throughout the whole of those realms the glad tidings of salvation. We are, therefore, as His chosen ministers, citizens of the world; and our business is not with any one nation or particular branch of the human family, but with the whole race of Adam.

(6.) It is not a sufficient reason for dismissing the claims of Foreign Missions, that you are regarded as having peculiar qualifications for distinguished usefulness at home. This is often said in relation to young men of more than ordinary gifts; and many, as we have had painful reason to know, have dismissed the subject from their minds on this ground alone. But this is a sad and grievous mistake, and can not be resisted with too much energy. Paul did not act on this principle. Henry Martin, Alexander Duff, and other modern Missionaries, of scarcely less note, had all the talents necessary to have occupied the first positions of influence in their native land; but they never thought of this, as a reason for turning their backs upon the heathen: nor is it probable that any of them would have done as much for the upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom, or have acquired the world-wide influence they did, if they had staid at home. Besides this, we know of no gifts or attainments that would render a young man especially acceptable and useful at home, that would not equally enhance his usefulness and acceptability abroad. Popular oratory, distinguished scholarship, refined manners, amiability of disposition, and whatever else would endear a young man to the heart of a civilized and Christian community, would render him no less acceptable and effective

as a Missionary among the heathen. Some of these nations give more attention to the cultivation of personal manners than we do ourselves; and, in relation to those that stand lowest in the scale of civilization, it is a great mistake to suppose that, because they are without refinement themselves, that therefore they have no appreciation of it in others. No where in the world will you find closer observers of the manners, disposition, and general deportment of men, and no where have these things a more positive influence, than among these uncultivated races; and, surely, in the study of their customs, their habits, their superstitions, their systems of false religion, and especially their languages, there is scope enough for the exercise of the strongest intellects of the Church. So far, therefore, from admitting the claim of the home-field to a monopoly of the best talents of the Church, we hold that the foreign field has, to say the least, a just claim to a full and equal share.

(7.) The fact that you have received a call to the care of a church, or some other position of usefulness in your native country, even before your studies are completed, is no certain evidence that the call is from God, or that you are thereby exonerated from going to the heathen. You might have two of these calls on hand at the same time, and as it would be impossible for you to respond to both, it would be certain that one of them was not from God; and why might this not be the case with both? But if you are bound to examine every call that is presented to your consideration (and you undoubtedly are), are you not equally bound to consider those unuttered, but not less real calls, that are coming up to you from all parts of the heathen world? Is it nothing to you, that one hundred millions of perishing men in Africa virtually cry out, "Come over and help us?" Is there nothing to move your compassion or to call for your aid in that profound ignorance and untold misery that afflicts every portion of India,

China, Japan, and all the rest of the heathen world? Is there no voice in those special interpositions of Divine providence that are laying open all these nations to the influences of the Gospel? Has the command of the Saviour, that His Gospel should be preached to all these nations, lost its power and authority over the hearts of men?

REAL DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF ENGAGING IN THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY WORK.

But there are real hindrances in the way of entering upon this work, and we propose now to point out a few of the more weighty and serious of these.

(1.) We may have dependent friends and relatives, thrown upon us by the providence of God, whom we may not leave, even for the high and holy purpose of becoming Foreign Missionaries. Aged and infirm parents, who have no other dependence; a feeble and dependent brother or sister; children, who are dependent upon us for education and general training, and whom it might not be possible or desirable to take with us to a foreign land, belong to this class. These relationships are providential, and are not to be overlooked or disregarded. They are indications of God's will that we are not to take part in this great work, whatever may be our desires or qualifications in other respects.

(2.) We may be debarred, again, from taking part in this work by the want of health or constitutional vigor. Most of the countries to be evangelized have climates different from our own. Three-fourths of the heathen inhabitants of the earth are to be found in tropical regions. A change from a cold or temperate to a hot climate, is a severe trial to the soundest and most healthy constitutions; and, of course, must be much more so to a feeble one, especially where there is a predisposition to diseases peculiar to warm climates. Too much care, therefore, can not be exercised in relation to this matter. To send a young man

with a feeble or unsound constitution to labor in one of these trying climates, would not only be an unjustifiable waste of missionary money, but might do the young man himself irreparable injury. As the field of missionary labor is enlarged, however, we shall have brought within the range of our choice a much greater variety of climate; so that one who could not endure the heat of Africa, would do well in the plateau lands and mountain regions of New Grenada; and one who found the climate of India and Siam too relaxing, might enjoy a more bracing air in Northern China and Japan.

(3.) The want of capacity to acquire a foreign language, may be regarded as a serious, if not insuperable, difficulty in the way of engaging in this work. It is scarcely possible for any one to become an effective Missionary without acquiring the language of the people for whom he is to labor. The use of interpreters, except as a temporary expedient, is a most indirect and unsatisfactory mode of reaching the heart of any people. The only true index we can have to the character of a heathen community, and the only way by which any material influence can be brought to bear upon their conduct, is through the medium of their own language. It is of indispensable importance, therefore, to the Missionary, that he understand the language of the people among whom he is to live. The difficulties of acquiring these languages, however, are often exaggerated. There are but few young men of ordinary abilities who could not, with proper patience and perseverance, master almost any of these heathen languages. In all the range of our observation, we have never known but two individuals who, after proper effort, failed to accomplish the task. As a general rule, living languages are more easily acquired than those that are known as the dead languages; and those who have succeeded in acquiring a creditable knowledge of the latter, need have no serious fears about the former. Among the different heathen na-

tions there is as much variety in language as there is diversity in climate. The Chinese, the Japanese, and a few of the Indian dialects, are regarded as intrinsically difficult; whilst the Hindi, the Siamese, and most of the dialects of Africa, are comparatively easy. Reference can always be had to this in assigning to young men their fields of labor.

(4.) Having stated some of the more specific reasons for not entering upon the missionary work, we may now state, in a more general way, that where the convictions of an individual, that he ought to labor at home, are very strong and decided; where he is conscious of no shrinking from the perils and hardships of the missionary life, but would be willing, so far as he knows his own heart, to go any where at the bidding of his Saviour; and where these personal convictions are sustained by the hearty and spontaneous concurrence of views on the part of his friends, his teachers and his ecclesiastical advisers, we should regard all this as the voice of God, settling the question of his duty to remain at home. Due care ought to be exercised, however, in scrutinizing the motives of his own heart, as well as the reasons assigned by his advisers, for his remaining at home.

Now, in reviewing the reasons and arguments adduced on either side of the question before us, let it not be said that we have made the road to the foreign field so broad, and that to the home work so narrow, that we would promote the good of the one at the expense of the other. If this were really the case, our argument would not only be one-sided, but our plan, put in practical operation, would be injurious alike to the interests of religion at home and abroad. The Church at home is the source of the missionary spirit; and if the fountain be dried up, the streams must necessarily cease to flow. But this is not the legitimate result of the course we are advocating. On the contrary, we firmly believe that there is no way by which the Church can more effectually increase her strength and

power, than by proper efforts to make her influence felt in every direction. There is in the economy of Divine grace a scattering that increaseth, and a withholding that tendeth to poverty. The missionary spirit, rightly construed, is the very life of the Church; and where that prevails, there can scarcely be spiritual dearth. What the Church at home needs is, not so much the multiplication of her ministers—though she needs this, too—as the infusion into those she already has, and those about to enter her service, of the spirit of their divine Master. A given number of men, possessing the zeal of Paul, of Luther, of Wesley, or of Whitefield, would do far more to promote the piety of the Church, and secure the salvation of sinners, than any multiple of that number without their zeal. If even one-half of the members of each successive graduating class from our Seminaries should become Foreign Missionaries, instead of being an injury, we believe, under God, it would be the indirect cause of the richest blessing to all our churches. Who knows what influence it would not exert in stirring up her ministers to the proper standard of piety and zeal; in calling pious young men to the ministry, to take the place of those who go abroad; and in calling forth the energies of the Church at large? May this not be the very means that God has appointed for bringing the Church up to the true standard of piety? Does any one seriously believe that the Church will ever make shipwreck of the faith, or destroy her own life and power, by following too closely in the footsteps of her great Leader?

QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MISSIONARY WORK.

Have I the qualifications to become a Foreign Missionary? This is a question that must necessarily occupy many of the thoughts of every young man who turns his attention to the subject of personal engagement in the work. It is an essential element in the question whether we are called by God to this work or not. Much that

might be said under this general head has been anticipated in the previous part of our remarks. What remains to be said might be included in one general statement, viz.: that those very traits of character, attainments in piety, knowledge and scholarship, that would render a man an effective minister at home, would make him no less so as a Foreign Missionary. There is no safer criterion, perhaps, by which to judge of a man's fitness for the Foreign Missionary work, than the estimate entertained of him by his friends, his associates in study, and his instructors. If they can render a united verdict in his favor, no stronger recommendation can reasonably be asked. If, on the other hand, he is wanting in any of the qualities already mentioned, and especially if any doubts are entertained about his usefulness at home, he ought not to be thought of as a Foreign Missionary. But we may, without unduly protracting our article, point out a few of the more obvious and important qualifications of the Missionary.

(1.) One of the first and most indispensable of these is, unreserved consecration to the service of the Lord Jesus. In directing his steps to the heathen world, he must not be governed by the impulses of romance, the love of adventure, or any motives of personal ambition, but by a simple desire to honor and obey his Redeemer. This ought to be the actuating motive in choosing the work in the first place, and the controlling, sustaining principle in all his future labors. He is to remember that the work has been authorized by the Lord Jesus, that His honor and glory are involved in carrying it on, and that He will assuredly sustain all those engaged in it, whatever trials, disappointments and temporary reverses He may allow them to encounter.

(2.) Habits of industry and study are indispensable to a successful Missionary. To acquire a foreign language, though it be comparatively easy, requires much study. Nor is less study necessary to understand the character of the people, their habits of thought and action, their super-

stitions, their traditions, and their systems of false religion. These things are not patent to transient observation, but can be understood only after the closest investigation and scrutiny. But, more than all, the translation of God's word into these languages, which some of the Missionaries, at least, must undertake, is one of the most difficult and laborious tasks that can be laid on any man's shoulders.

(3.) A cheerful temperament and habit are of great importance to the Foreign Missionary. The circumstances of missionary life call for its daily exercise: so much so, that a man of a peevish, morose, or jealous disposition will sink down at once, and leave the work altogether, or will remain only to annoy his associates in labor. A cheerful disposition, therefore, can not be cultivated with too much diligence. The Missionary ought to be able to look at the bright side of every picture, and learn how to draw comfort and encouragement even in the most adverse dispensations of providence. He must be patient and persevering in his efforts to bring men to the knowledge of the Saviour; must know how to make allowance for the ignorance, the perverseness, and ingratitude of the heathen; must be able to check any uprising of fretfulness in his own bosom towards them, by remembering that if Christ can bear with them, he ought; and by remembering, also, how much more forbearance the Saviour has exercised towards himself, than he is called upon to exercise towards them. The Missionary is also to sustain himself by looking forward, by the eye of faith, to the fulfilment of all those rich promises made by the Saviour in relation to the latter day glory, when every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess to Him; when He shall see of the travail of His soul, and be satisfied; when the heathen shall be given to Him for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession; and when all on earth, as in heaven, shall unite in ascribing honor, and power, and glory, and dominion, to Him that sitteth upon the throne.

MOTIVES TO ENGAGE IN THIS GREAT WORK.

We proceed, in the last place, to glance at some of those motives that should impel young men to take a share in this great work. These, however, are so numerous, so weighty, and so varied withal, that it is difficult to determine which should be selected for more special consideration. We can do little more than glance at a few of the leading ones.

(1.) The opportunity it offers us to honor the Redeemer. This is the highest motive that can be presented to any Christian mind; and it is a matter of wonder that every Christian disciple does not earnestly desire to avail himself of it to show his attachment to his Saviour. There are other places and ways, it is true, by which He may be honored; and if He makes it our duty to stay at home, our services, if faithfully performed, will not be less acceptable. But going to a far-off heathen land, to spend one's life in complete isolation from all that the human heart usually counts dear, requires a measure of faith, self-denial, courage, and devotion to His cause, which must be more than ordinarily pleasing to the Saviour, and which can scarcely fail to impress the minds of men with the sincerity of His followers, and the power of that religion by which they are governed. And when it is remembered what the Saviour has done for us, what He is still doing, and what He has promised yet to do; when we remember what transporting hopes He has enkindled in the hearts of men, and what ample provision He has made for their salvation; when we remember what glorious results He has promised to bring about through the agency of the Church, even the subjugation of all the heathen nations of the earth to His dominion; and when we reflect how short is the term of human life, in which alone our agency can be employed in bringing about these glorious results, is it not surprising, amazing, that we do not all earnestly desire to have a share in

it? Is it not surprising that we need to be reminded of our duty at all? Is it not strange that I should now be using all the little powers of persuasion that God has given me, to induce you to engage in a work of which there is not an angel in heaven that would not count it an honor and a privilege to be a sharer?

(2.) Another motive is to be found in the example of Apostles and primitive Christians. If ever there was a set of men on earth who, it may be taken for granted, understood the mind of their Master, or the nature and extent of the work He gave them to perform, it was they. They commenced their labors, it is true, at Jerusalem. This was not only the most natural course, but it was in strict accordance with the command of their ascended Saviour. Some of these men, there is reason to believe, spent the whole of their lives in labors in their native land. But this was not the case with the majority of them, and especially with those whose lives and labors are more fully spread out in the word of God. These, according to the testimony of the Scriptures, went every where, proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ; and although we have in the Acts of the Apostles but an imperfect outline of their actual labors and journeyings, yet from this very source we learn that there was scarcely a village, town, or city in Palestine, Samaria, Asia Minor, Macedon, Greece, or Rome, that could not testify to the untiring zeal of these holy men. And in ages immediately following, as we know from reliable history, the Gospel was preached, and Christian churches were founded, in almost every portion of the earth that was accessible in that day. Now, did those holy men transcend their commission? Are not our duties and obligations coextensive with theirs? Should we have less desire to honor the Redeemer? Are not the souls of our fellow-men as precious now as they were then?

(3.) The circumstances and necessities of our fellow-men all over the heathen world, furnish another powerful mo-

tive to stimulate our zeal. It is true, they have reduced themselves to the lowest depths of degradation by their own wilful rebellion against Jehovah. But have they less claim to our sympathy and compassion on this account? It is not for us to assume that there can be no salvation for the heathen, except through the medium of the Gospel. But so far as we have any knowledge on the subject, or any authority upon which to base our action, we are shut up to the conclusion that there can be no salvation for adult heathen without some knowledge of the Gospel. Is it not an established article in the creed of every evangelical denomination, and the utterance of every evangelical pulpit in the land, that there is and can be no salvation for mortal man, except through faith in the merits of a crucified Redeemer? But, in the language of God's word, "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent?" No, let us be honest with ourselves, to our fellow-men, and to the great Head of the Church, and realize and confess that these millions of our fellow-men must go down to their graves and to the judgment seat unblessed, unless we impart to them in this world the light of the Gospel. And what will be their astonishment, aye! their overwhelming anguish, when they come to see in the clear light of eternity that they might have been saved!—that there was provided, from the foundation of the world, just such a Saviour as they sometimes felt they needed! What bitter reproaches may we not suppose they will utter against those of us who possessed that Gospel, and who ought and could, but did not, impart it to them!

(4.) The intervention of God's providence, within a few years past, in removing obstacles and laying open all the great heathen nations of the earth to the influences of the Gospel, furnishes another most weighty motive for entering

upon this work. For long centuries these nations have not only been dwelling in the deepest heathen gloom, but they have been, in a great measure, inaccessible to the Missionary. Why this was permitted is one of those mysteries of Divine providence which we may never be able fully to solve in this present world. But however deplorable may have been their condition in times past, a better and brighter day, we firmly believe, is now beginning to dawn upon them. There are at the present moment many unmistakeable signs that God's set time to favor these nations is drawing nigh. Actual experiment has shown that missionary labors may be carried on in Africa, notwithstanding the intensity of her torrid heat, the insalubrity of her climate, and the savage character of her people. Recent explorations have revealed all the secrets of her geography, her populations, and her abundant, but as yet undeveloped, resources; whilst the commerce of the civilized world is furnishing means of access to almost every portion of her benighted inhabitants. For many long centuries China, with her four hundred millions of immortal beings, seemed to have been surrounded with impassable walls, and there were no human means by which the light of the Gospel could be made to shine upon her benighted inhabitants. But, in the providence of God, all those walls have been thrown down, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ may now be proclaimed, without let or hindrance, throughout the whole of her vast dominions. Japan, for more than three centuries, was cut off from all intercourse with the Christian world by the severest legal enactments; and South America, for nearly an equal period, was almost as effectually barred from all evangelical influences by papal intolerance. But Japan has relaxed her austerity, and South America now stretches out a friendly hand to the Protestant Missionary. Now, what has brought about all these changes? Surely, naught but the providence of God. And is there no lan-

guage for us in these providences? Is not God thus saying to us, Go up and possess the land?

(6.) Another motive to excite our zeal is to be found in the fact that there is no risk, no uncertainty, in relation to the results of this great enterprise. In all human undertakings, there is of necessity great risk and uncertainty. If we spend our energies in the acquisition of wealth, we may fail altogether, or succeed only to learn how worthless and unsatisfying wealth is. We may earn the highest reputation among men that the human heart can possibly desire, and yet live to see that reputation withered and blasted in our own grasp. We may aid in laying the foundation of the best human government that can be conceived, and yet live to see that government crumble to atoms. But what we do for the upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom can not possibly fail. His is an everlasting kingdom, and must endure, though the heavens and the earth pass away. God has promised to His Son to give Him the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession; and His promises are yea and amen. When, therefore, we labor for the upbuilding and extension of His kingdom, we labor for what can not possibly fail; and though we may not know it fully here, we shall be able in the light of a better world to see that we have not labored in vain.

(7.) In the next and last place, let us draw an argument from the condition and circumstances of our southern Zion. As a Christian body, we have just launched upon a new and independent existence. We were brought to this measure, not so much as a matter of choice, as the result of an overruling providence. God, undoubtedly, had some great and special object in separating us from our northern brethren. What that object was, we already see in part, and will no doubt understand more fully hereafter. At the commencement of our career, every thing is as favorable as could be desired. Harmony and unanimity of views on

the part of those who were intrusted with the duty of arranging and completing the external organization of the church; the full confidence and hearty support of all the churches embraced in this organization; freedom, at the beginning, from many of the inconveniences and incumbrances that clogged our former ecclesiastical connexion; soundness in the faith on the part of our churches, and a very general appreciation of the solemn and responsible duties imposed upon us by the providence of God in this new relation, are favors for which we can not feel too thankful to the great Head of the Church. But if we would have this church of ours take a high and commanding position among her sister churches; if she would secure for herself a precious and enduring name on earth; and, above all, if she would endear herself to the heart of her great Head, she must devote her energies to the work of spreading the knowledge of the Gospel among all the nations of the earth. This is one of the two great ends of her being as a church. As a people, we have all the means, the facilities, and, I believe, the *heart*, to take a large share in this work; and the great question now is, will her sons and daughters become the willing and ready agents in carrying it on? This question is submitted to your prayerful consideration, and it is for you, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to answer it.

At the present moment we are in the midst of trials, such as most of us never expected to witness on earth; and such, we may humbly pray, as may not again visit our land. But are we to draw no practical lessons from these troublous scenes? Where has there ever been witnessed such sublimity of patriotism, such outpouring of wealth, such sacrifice of self and kindred, such readiness to forego every thing that is dear to the human heart, as have been shown in these Confederate States since the commencement of our present conflict? Do we not all feel that society has been stirred to its very lowest depths? Where is the mother

that has refused to give up her son, the sister her brother, or the wife her husband, for the defence of the country?

But why all this? It is simply to defend ourselves and our posterity from an impending human despotism. But there is a more terrible despotism than any with which we are threatened. It is that crushing, unresisted despotism that the arch-enemy of God and man has been exercising over the heathen nations of the earth for these many long centuries. For those who lie crushed beneath his iron tread, the Son of God has poured forth His blood, and commands us to go forth and preach deliverance to them. Shall we not emulate the zeal, the energy, and the indomitable perseverance of those who are battling for civil liberty? Shall we do nothing to free these millions of our fellow-men from the terrible bondage in which they are held? May we not hope to see the time when God's people will display as much zeal and earnestness in emancipating these millions from their spiritual thraldom, as is now displayed by our countrymen in warding off this threatened political despotism?

THE LAW OF THE SABBATH, IN ITS BEARING UPON NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

To those who believe in a God, and in a world to come; who believe that there is such a thing as sin, and that it will not go unpunished; it can never be a matter of small moment to know what God requires, what constitutes sin against God, and what will be the punishment of sin.

It is supposed that none will deny that as the aggregation of individuals constitutes nationalities, so the prevalence of any particular disposition or habit of good or evil in a greater part of the individuals composing a body politic, or in the constituted ruling or governing powers, gives a tone or character to that nation which they constitute, or over which they rule and preside: that is, that nations may be godly or ungodly, righteous or wicked; that there may be national sins and national punishments, national goodness and national blessings; or, in the language of Scripture, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

It will also be conceded by all right thinking minds that, whatever else may constitute sin, if God has given to His rational creatures a law, any violation of that law, which, as it comes from God, must be holy and just and good, will be sin against God.

These things being granted—and the writer is sure that they will find a responsive affirmation in the great heart of the people of this Confederacy—it is proposed to apply these principles to one special form in which sin presents itself; and to show that if, on the one hand, we as a nation walk according to God's law, there is before us a future of great prosperity and great blessing; and if, on the other hand, we violate God's law, there is before us a future of national degradation and fearful retribution.

The question, then, which we are to discuss, is simply this: Is there any law of the Sabbath now binding on the nations and peoples of the earth? and if so, what are its sanctions, its nature, and its penalties?

That God has proclaimed a law concerning the observance of the Sabbath, is evident from many parts of His word; from which it is also clear that this is the substance of that law, viz.: That the seventh part of man's time is to be kept holy to God; that on one day in each week man is to abstain from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days, except for so much of the time as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy. Man is to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

It is not necessary for the purposes of the present argument, to show which one of the seven days of the week is thus to be kept holy to God. Undoubtedly, at the first promulgation of the great sabbatic law, the seventh day was thus set apart by God. "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." It is beyond question, also, that when the law was recast, and repeated to the Jewish nation in the Decalogue, the seventh was the day appointed for this holy resting and worship; and that this continued to be the Sabbath day until the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is also a point settled beyond all controversy, that for good and sufficient reasons, into which it is not now necessary to enter, the Christian world has, since the resurrection, kept holy to God the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

The change in the day does not affect the principle of the law. That remains in all its original force. One-seventh of man's time is to be kept holy to God, and to be employed in His worship. What we are to show is this: that this principle is revealed to man by his Creator as a rule of moral duty; that it is not a mere police regulation of the Jewish economy, but that it is lifted into the sphere

of man's moral duty and obligation, and is, therefore, universally binding on all responsible creatures; and as such, is unrepealed and irrepealable.

Let it be remembered that a moral obligation is a perpetual obligation, binding on man as long as the constitution of his nature remains unchanged. If, therefore, the law of the Sabbath be of the nature of a moral law, it follows that the obligation to keep the law is for ever binding upon those to whom it is given. That the law of the Sabbath is of such a nature is clear, from the fact that it was given to man at his first creation, when in a state of innocence, before sin had come into the world, and before there were any indications of an atonement for sin. This law was given to man on a moral ground, without reference to a state of innocence more than to any other; therefore it is a moral law, and therefore its obligation is perpetual.

Moreover, this law was placed amongst the other moral precepts in the Decalogue, and is of the same nature or kind with them. It was with them proclaimed by the voice of God in the hearing of all the people; it was twice written by the finger of God upon the tables of stone, and lodged with them in the ark; which privileges were never conferred on any of the precepts of the ceremonial law. Hence it is plain that this law was considered by God to be a moral law, and to have the same binding force with the other moral precepts.

Besides, this law has never been repealed; it is over and over again repeated and referred to, in both the Old and New Testaments, as a law still in force; and it has, from the beginning to the present day, been recognized in some form by all christendom, and a large part of heathendom.

It follows, then, that if any precept of God's law be a moral law, the law of the Sabbath is such; and is, therefore, of perpetual obligation. Let it be remembered, therefore, that whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one, yea, in this one, he is guilty of all.

Again: It might be urged that as, in the nature of things, man's so-called moral-natural constitution indicates that worship is one of the duties which he owes to God, his Creator, so it would also indicate that some special time should be set apart for that worship. But it is sufficient for us that we have the positive declaration of God Himself, setting forth this obligation; placing it on a moral ground, with a positive precept as to what and how much time shall be set apart for His worship. And we have the special and peculiar sanctions and penalties with which He accompanies the promulgation of this law.

The plea, then, which is so often set up, that the Sabbath was a mere Jewish or a mere ceremonial institution, and that therefore its observance is not now binding, will be seen to be utterly nugatory and worthless. The law of the Sabbath is a *moral* law, binding upon all people and nations, always and every where. The principles upon which its obligation is sought to be set aside will, when carried out to their legitimate results, suffice to set aside the precepts against murder, adultery, theft, or any other precept of the moral law, and would leave a lost and fallen race with no regulative principles save their own lusts, their own desires, or their own prejudices. Let this logic, which is so artfully used to excuse the violation of this law, have full sway, and the nations of the earth would be left without a law; the universe without a God.

There remain now to be considered, for a full apprehension of the dignity and magnitude of this subject, the special and peculiar sanctions and penalties with which the promulgation of the law of the Sabbath is accompanied.

First: When we consider the very words of the statute, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," we see that God allows us six days of the week for our worldly affairs and employments. What, then, can be more unreasonable and ungrateful than our grudging Him the seventh

part of our time for His more immediate service and worship; especially as He claims this day for His own, and it is our greatest privilege and happiness to have access to Him and communion with Him on it? For, observe what a precious promise God makes to those who faithfully keep it holy: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."—Isa. 58 : 13, 14.

Second: Observe, again, the words of the law in the reason which God gives for its being kept holy by us: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day."

All these God could have completed, in all their beauty and perfection, in a moment, by a word; but He chose by His own example to fix the morality of six days for worldly labor, and of a seventh for holy rest: "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

God has so ordered it in His providence that the right observance of the Sabbath is not only no hindrance to the proper business of the week, but fits us better for its duties and labors. That this has been the experience of men the world over, admits of proof and illustration the most satisfactory and irrefragable. It stands proclaimed by the clearest and most incontestible evidence, that no man or nation of men ever, in the end, gained by the violation of this law; but they have ever suffered loss and punishment when the Sabbath has been desecrated or disregarded. One of God's servants has written it for our warning, and let not men forget his words: "In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine-presses on the Sabbath, and

bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon this city? Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath."—Neh. 13 : 15–18.

Another prophet of God declared unto the people, in words of still more solemn warning: "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palace of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."—Jer. 17 : 27.

Not to multiply evidence, of which there is much more, it is plain, from the dealings of God with His ancient people, and from His dealings with the nations of the earth ever since, that He looks with peculiar jealousy upon this law, and follows its violation with fearful retribution. It becomes us, then, as a Confederacy, in the infancy of our republic, already most signally blessed by marvellous interpositions of God in our behalf, to take heed unto ourselves, lest we provoke the righteous anger of our God; and it behoves our rulers that they see to it that "they bring not more wrath upon us by profaning the Sabbath."

The application of the great principles set forth in this essay is plain and pointed. "The prosperity and success of a nation depend upon the general tone of public sentiment and morals; and these, again, upon the power of true religion in the hearts of rulers and people." The nations that forget God, and despise His law, will God forsake and

destroy. But He will maintain the cause of them that remember His commandments to do them.

This question is the more momentous, as involving the destiny of this Confederacy; and all good and true men are called upon to stand up the more boldly and manfully upon the Lord's side: because of the peculiar proneness of men to break the great law of the Sabbath; because the violation of it is so peculiarly ungrateful and inexcusable on our part; and because this is one of the sins which has, in a measure, come down to us by entail from the Federal Government.

It would be an insult to the public intellect, and to the common sense of the people of this Confederacy, to attempt to show that the transaction of ordinary official business, the carrying and delivering of the mails, and the running of railroad trains, upon the Sabbath day, are not works either of necessity or mercy; and are, therefore, violations of this law of God. What shall be said, then, of the weekly violation of both the law of the land and the law of God, in the desecration of the Sabbath by the traffic in city bar-rooms, and the opening of places of amusement, by which the dissolute are encouraged in vice; and by the glaring profanation of the day, seen in many of our country stores, where our negroes are in so many instances fleeced and swindled, or encouraged, directly or indirectly, in peculation and intemperance, to a degree which often throws whole communities into disorder?

The crimes of adultery, murder, and theft, each bears its own train of retributive consequences to the perpetrator; and should they prevail to such an extent as to become national crimes, it is easy to see to what a dreadful state of anarchy and ruin society would be brought. The crime of Sabbath-breaking, likewise, bears with it its own special punishment to him who is guilty of it; a punishment cumulative with the heaviest disasters to the State, when the crime grows to such a magnitude as to become national.

Nations suffer the punishment of their sins in this world. Individuals suffer both in this world and the world to come. Public sentiment is the aggregate of individual opinion. Public morals is the aggregate of individual morality.

Let thoughtful and sober men consider, and take hold of this matter, and endeavor by all lawful means, through the pulpit, the hustings, and the press, so to mould and control public opinion, that we may be saved, as a nation, from the crime of Sabbath-breaking, and thereby saved from God's righteous wrath and indignation.

ARTICLE III.

THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN THE CLASSICS.

Homer and Hesiod flourished, probably, near the time of the prophet Elijah. That was about nine hundred years before the Christian era. Sappho is placed by the chronologists three hundred years later. That was about six hundred years before Christ. Then come Anacreon, Æschylus, Pindar, and Herodotus, in the sixth and fifth centuries before our era. Then come Socrates and his successors, and with them the real commencement of the classic epoch, about four hundred years before the birth of Christ. This is just about the date of the prophet Malachi. The voice of prophecy ceased among the Hebrews just as the light of letters began fully to shine among the Greeks. At the time of the birth of Christ, when the light of the New Testament was about to dawn upon all nations, the classical epoch was approaching its sunset. Whatever is

most valuable in Greek literature, with the poems of Virgil and Horace among the Romans, had already been produced. The classics seem to be an interlude between the two Testaments.

If we regard the rise of the nations of the world as arranged in a great scheme of divine providence, it is difficult to believe that this exquisite classic culture, which arose in Greece and Italy during this period of the significant silence of inspiration, had no meaning in such scheme of divine providence. Among the Hebrews, a vast and splendid system of types, shadows, and prophecies had been long preparing the faithful among that people for the reception of the Redeemer. True, the Hebrews were the chosen people. The Greeks were not. But all nations then, as now, rightfully belonged to Jehovah, whether He dwelt among them seated between the cherubim in the most Holy Place, or whether they ignorantly worshipped Him as "the unknown God." If the Spirit of God employed the language of the Hebrews for the Old Testament, He employed that of the Greeks for the New. It is difficult to believe that a literature thus elegant, chiefly developed after the Old Testament was ended, which was well-nigh completed when the New Testament began, which furnished the language in which the words and works of the Saviour and His apostles have their permanent record, had no more meaning in the scheme of divine providence than is usually ascribed to it, and was no step forward in preparing the world to receive its Redeemer.

Among the Hebrews an illustrious line of kings pointed steadily forwards to the crown and sceptre of a Divine King. A gorgeous succession of high priests indicated the coming of a High Priest of nobler nature. A sublime series of prophets gave assurance, both as types and by express prophecies, that the prophetic mantle was to fall on a Divine Prophet in the latter day. Among pagan nations, other than the Greeks, the blood of sacrifices was per-

petually flowing on their altars, as an involuntary prophecy of the Redeemer. Did Plato and Aristotle, Sophocles and Euripides, Pericles and Demosthenes, mean nothing in the world's great chant of prophecy and of preparation, during that four hundred years?

The operations of rural life were so ordered as to be mirrors, ready for the great Teacher when he came, in which he showed the form and lineaments of the truths which accompany man's redemption. A sower goes forth to sow his seed, and as it falls into its various places, gives us a picture of the preaching and reception of the Gospel. A merchant-man seeks goodly pearls, and shows us how a wise man understands the worth of his own soul. By hiding a little leaven in three measures of meal, a woman exhibits a picture of the spread of the Gospel through society. Men go fishing in the Sea of Galilee, and draw a picture of the Church of Jesus Christ. An enemy sows tares in a ploughed field, and we are thereby shown the mixed state of things in this world, awaiting the fearful searching of the great judgment day. A shepherd followed by his flock, is an image of the Good Shepherd and his chosen people.

Not only were these common operations of life employed in the structure of parables for the illustration of religious truth. Almost precisely the same use is made, in the Scriptures, of the objects of nature around us. The sun is an image, in a certain sense, of Jesus Christ, on the pages of one of the prophets: "Unto you that fear my name, shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings." The rain, also, speaks Him forth, when it descends to refresh the ground: "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth." Before those whose hearts do not love Him, He shall "grow up as a tender plant, as a root out of a dry ground." To those who see some thing of His glory through His lowly guise, He is the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valleys.

The power of His Spirit in the regeneration of the hearts of men, is like the wind which "bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth."

As has been remarked by John Foster, there seems to have been established around us a great system of things of various descriptions, adumbrating to us the things which concern our salvation. Some have understood as applying to this parallelism of the world without and the world within us, that deep, dark saying of the wise man, in Ecclesiastes: "He hath made every thing beautiful in His time: also He hath set the world in their heart;" as if there were within a man's soul just such a reflexion of external things, as there is of the stars in the sky on a clear night in the surface of a tranquil lake. We do not understand that every fulfilled prophecy of the Old Testament must necessarily be quoted as such in the New Testament; that every thing that was really a type of Christ in the Old Testament had to be mentioned as a type in the New, before we would be justifiable in recognizing it as such; that every operation of human life which throws light on divine truth is introduced in the parables of our Saviour; or that every object of nature is mentioned in the Scriptures, which may properly be made an illustrative image of Christ, or of His grace. Nor do we believe that the Old Testament, the operations of common life, and the natural objects around us, are the only sources from which inspired truth may receive illustration. Ample room and verge is left for the pulpit, and for uninspired literature. We have hardly heard richer, more appropriate, or more effective illustrations in the pulpit than those drawn, if skilfully and pertinently drawn, from the classic mythology and history. We utter no hint against the delightful and instructive practice of illustrating Scripture by Scripture. We only plead for a wider range of thought, a field of illustration richer, because embracing that and some thing more be-

sides. And we feel that this is some good, at least, which the Greek and Roman culture have done to religion, in the providence of God.

Because some Deists have formerly, in the blindness of unbelief, turned away from the clear light of the Christian revelation, and attempted to construct for themselves a religion made out of the crudities and superstitions of the ancient philosophies, therefore, too often, Christian writers have adopted a strain of jealous depreciation in their reviews of the Greek philosophy, and have fallen into the temptation of treating Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Seneca, as if they were rivals of Jesus Christ, or of John, or of Paul. We do not think that this is to magnify the Redeemer and his apostles, but to degrade them in fact.

The mistake is simply a misconception of the reason why Divine Providence has put the ancient classics into our hands. It is only by regarding them as revelations of moral and religious truth, that they can be made, in any sense, rivals of the Scriptures. Such a pretension is set up for the Greek classics in these days, we should imagine, by extremely few thinking minds. On that ground we should have to make battle even with grand old Plato himself, but the victory would be extremely easy. Yet the result of such battle usually is, that the Christian combatant loses sight, by means of false issues, of the real object of the divine munificence in transmitting the classic authors from age to age—that is, the culture of the human mind in the forms of natural and beautiful thought.

Let us a little further explain what we mean.

A Christian apologist, of severe metaphysical temper, meets with a cold Deist, who asserts that "the Christian Fathers received their notions of the Trinity, not from the New Testament, but from Plato. The remedy is that easy one, to prove that the doctrine of the Trinity *is* taught in the New Testament; in the forms of baptism and benediction, for instance, and clearly enough otherwise, also; to

say, in fact, as one of the Christian Fathers said: "*Abi, Ariane, ad Jordanum, et vide Trinitatem!*"

But such apologist sits down thoroughly to search the magic pages of the poet-philosopher, not for those beautiful conceptions of nature with which they abound, but to prove that his tenets on morals and religion are not to be compared with those of our Lord, or those of the apostles Paul, or Peter, or John. He concludes his search, like Dr. Enoch Pond, by saying: "Such is the religion, the philosophy, the morality of Plato. And now who will venture to bring a system like this, contradicted at a thousand points by the decisions of reason, conscience, and truth, into comparison with the Christian Scriptures? Could Platonism endure such a comparison for a moment? And yet Plato was a learned man; and most of the writers of our Scriptures were illiterate men. Plato was a noble Greek, trained in the very focus of ancient wisdom; while the writers of our Scriptures were poor, despised Jews. How, then, did these Jews attain to their superior incomparable light and knowledge?"

Of course, by speaking and writing as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The triumph is easy and complete. But we feel as if it was not much more complete after this depreciation of Plato than before; and we feel doubtful whether Dr. Pond has done as much good by winning over again a battle so often fought and thoroughly won before, as he has done harm by trying Plato upon an erroneous issue. Not one man in ten thousand, we should suppose, searches the Greek Philosophers now-a-days for opinions to be embraced as religious doctrines, or sets their teachings, as sources of truth, into comparison with the clear certainty, the pure sanctity, the self-evidencing majesty of the Holy Scriptures. But how needlessly unjust to the Greek this Christian apologist permits the Deist to make him? Did not the Lord Jehovah raise up Plato in this world, and send him into life, for his own wise purposes,

just as much as He raised up Pharaoh, and Cyrus, and Darius? He had a purpose in the life of these kings. So He had in the life of Plato. But it certainly was not as revealer of correct views of morals, religion, or theology. One of His purposes may have been to show that unaided human wisdom can not attain correct opinions on those subjects. But we submit that in that point of view, it is not the proper logic to decry and depreciate Plato, but to extol him as the very acme and crown of the Greek culture. But Dr. Pond has weighed him in balances which were never intended for him, or he for them, and has only therefore found him wanting. For all that he has shown, Plato was, and was splendidly and gloriously, another quite different thing; inferior, indeed, but a good thing, and a beautiful thing, which the Lord Jehovah purposed that Plato should be. Why not depreciate Bonaparte, because he could not preach like Massillon? or Washington, because he produced no philosophical works equal to the Novum Organum? or Chalmers, because he could not have written Hamlet or Paradise Lost? It may be said that Plato *dealt* in discussions on moral, religious, and theological subjects. True. But no one who had so little light from revelation ever sighed for such light more earnestly than did he; as may be seen in the Second Alcibiades, where he pines for a heaven-descended teacher to dispel his doubts and darkness, till we almost think we hear the echo of the voice of Isaiah: "O that thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down." And, for all that we know, had he been on Areopagus when the great apostle to the Gentiles stood there to declare to Athenians the unknown God, whom they ignorantly worshipped, he might have enrolled his name with that of Dionysius the Areopagite, as a ready receiver of that heavenly revelation which he so coveted. Surely, Plato is no rival of the apostles, except in that blind and half-demented species of unbelief, which made the "Lord of Irony," Edward Gibbon, after sneering for a

life-time at the purest and most sacred truths, declare himself a Montanist! a believer in one of the most vulgar corruptions of the early centuries!

In the exordium of his sublime oration for the crown, the Athenian orator, Demosthenes, prays to all the gods and goddesses that the Athenian people may bear such good will to him in that fearful contest as he has ever borne to their city and to themselves. Plato, in his ideal republic, sets up the Fourierite doctrine, that wives shall be in common, that all children shall be the property of the State, and, of course, that no man shall know his own offspring. The Greek poems are all more or less imbued with their pagan religion. Probably one of the most consummately beautiful productions in existence is the first ode of the chorus, in the Œdipus Tyrannus, to the Delian Apollo. Now, when a Christian father, justly solicitous what reading falls into the hands of his gifted, imaginative, susceptible son of eighteen years of age, sees that son devote himself with almost a passion to the pages of Demosthenes, of Plato, and of Sophocles, does he fear that that son will imbibe from those pages the worship of the thirty thousand divinities of the Athenians, embraced in the appeal of Demosthenes, or the Fourierite doctrine taught by Plato, or the special adoration of the Delian Apollo, as the god of soothsaying, so beautifully praised in Sophocles? When his son reads Homer and Virgil, does such a father fear that he will adopt the views of the unseen world given in the accounts of the descent of Ulysses and Eneas into Tartarus, and their visions of the miserable *dantes poenas* in those doleful regions? We never heard of one single instance of either description, among all the youths who have been engaged in the study of the classics among us.

What book takes a deeper hold upon a thoughtful mind advancing to manhood than Horace? How many passages of his calm, stoic philosophy we bear away from school with us! How the "Tu ne quæsieris, scire nefas, quem

mihi, quem tibi;" the "Persicos odi, puer, apparatus;" the "Equam memento rebus arduis;" the "Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum;" and the "Eheu! fugaces, Posthume, Posthume, labuntur anni," sing themselves through our minds in after years! But none of us, we venture to say, can mention a single instance among the companions of our years at school, of a youth converted to the creed of what Milton calls "the budge doctors of the stoic fur," by the perusal of the odes of Horace. And we can name many instances in which more of the life of the stoics would have brought them more within sound of the voice of the inspired apostles.

"But there is nothing of Christ in the writings of the Greeks and Romans. Augustine could not relish his before so much admired Cicero, because he could not find the name of Jesus in all his pages." Our hearts warm towards him who says this. We feel towards him like Cowper towards the man whom he saw singing a hymn very heartily in a church close by him: "Bless you for praising Him whom my soul loves." It would be an overwhelming argument, and would not leave another word to be said, if we brought forward the classics as books of doctrine, or of devotion, or of tenet of any kind, on any kindred subject which we expected or feared to imbibe. And in reference to books which the Christian fondles, and admits freely to intercourse with his inner emotions, it has a proper weight, and ought to be permitted to exert its influence.

Precisely the same objection, however, may be substantially raised against Shakspeare, Thomson, Byron, and Walter Scott. There is nothing like godliness, or true Christian spiritual life, in the works of either of them. Perhaps Thomson's Hymn to the Seasons might be uttered by a Christian heart; but one would wish to see some thing of Christ in it, before accepting it as Christianity. We verily believe that Sophocles and Euripides were every way as good men, and as near to the kingdom of heaven, as Lord

Byron and Sir Walter Scott. If Tyre and Sidon shall rise up in the judgment against the men of highly favored generations, because those heathen nations would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes, and have entered into the kingdom of heaven, if they had enjoyed such privileges, we see not why the Greek tragedians may not stand up in the judgment against the English misanthrope and scoffer, and the Scottish caricaturist of religion, and condemn them, on the same grounds of judgment. And we would a thousand times rather see a son, if gifted, imaginative, susceptible, and eighteen years old, devote himself to Sophocles and Euripides, than to Byron and Scott. And we solemnly believe that there is verily little more idolatry taught, and not half as much apt to be imbibed, from the pages of these two Greeks, as from those of these two Britons.

But the objection will lead us too far. There is nothing more of Christ in the lofty mountains, the clear lakes, the green meadows, the swift rivers, the mighty ocean, the gorgeous clouds, and the blue sky of heaven, than there is in the Greek classics; except as the eye of faith may see Him in them all, as the Author of all the works of God. We mean to say, with the author of the Epistle to the Romans, that it is only "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world" which "are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." But of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ, and of salvation through faith in His name, there is nothing revealed in the natural works of God. This life and immortality through our Saviour Jesus Christ, is that which is "brought to light in the Gospel."

The principle, therefore, which would lead us to deny our children the riches of the classic pages, would not only lead us to keep from them the writings of all unregenerate men in their own language, however splendid their genius or instructive their thoughts; but if we have fairly appre-

hended it, it would also commit Paley's Natural Theology and the Bridgewater Treatises to the Ephesian fires, as mere worthless implements of those who "use curious arts."

Nor is this all. If it is not allowable for our sons to read, in the pages of Plato and Sophocles, descriptions of Mount Hymettus, and of the plane-trees on the banks of the Ilissus, and of the twitter of the cicada, and of the calm discourse of the philosophers amid the beautiful scenery of Athenian summer, it is hard to see how it can be allowable for them to see our own mountains, to seek our own shade-trees, to listen at home to the chorus of the summer bird and bee and insect, or to live amid the beautiful air of our own summer scenery. So, then, the wonderful variety of hues and tints and shades of colors around us, in the mountains, and the fields, and the meadows, and the orchards, are made in vain. They are to be held as forbidden and ungodly luxuries. The splendid pictures which the sunbeams draw with colors of ray and shadow, and mild light, and deep shade, on the hills, in the valleys, in the morning, and in the evening; the countless different faces of the sky, in summer and in winter, in sunshine and in storm, in the fair day and in the starry night; all the sublimity of the ocean, in calm silence or amid the wild roar of the storm, are to go for nothing. We must teach our son to shut his eyes and stop his ears to these things, because they do not directly teach the story of redemption! Christianity is a more independent, a broader, a more benign, and a more fearless thing, by far, than this narrow principle would make it.

We believe we might safely venture the remark, that the religion of few generations of men any where has been injured by their excessive perusal of the Greek classics. The only probable exception remembered to this remark, is to be found at Alexandria, in Egypt, during the time of the New Academy, under Ammonias Saccas and his succes-

sors. There arose there a hybrid mixture of Christianity and the monstrous oriental cosmogonies with the philosophical opinions of the later Platonists. But it is as unfair to call Proclus, and Plotinus, and Iamblichus, followers of Plato, as to call Carlstadt, and Bœhmen, and Münzer, followers of Martin Luther, or to consider Hymeneus and Philetus followers of the apostle Paul.

There is said to have been a large and valuable collection of books, chiefly Greek and Roman writers, made by king Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt, which might have been of incalculable value had it been preserved. It was, however, burned. The pretext for this stupid act of vandalism is reported to have been, that if what was in those books was in the Koran, then they were useless; and if what was in them was not in the Koran, then they were false. There were, at one time, Christian men in this country who indulged, even in the pulpit, in wishes that all the books in the world, except the Bible, were burned. They indulged freely, and apparently with the full approbation of their hearers generally, in flings and sneers at the ungodly pride of those "who had rubbed their backs against college walls," in the peculiar phraseology of that day. For a while they exerted a powerful influence. There was a great show of godliness about these utterances. They actually generated a pride of ignorance, far more thick-skinned and incorrigible than the pride of learning, against which they spent their thunderbolts. "They read nothing but the word of God, not they." (Some of them that with difficulty.) "They knew nothing but the word of God. They did not want to know any thing. They did not believe in book-learning to preach from. They believed in religion in the heart as the qualification of a preacher. And for their parts, when they preached, they went into the pulpit and opened their mouths, and God filled them." (Nonsense and all!)

Who could argue against such great devotion to the word of God? Who could maintain that a preacher ought not, above all things, to be devotedly and experimentally a pious man? It was all in vain to plead for piety *with* education. That was a contradiction in terms, in their logic. There may be some of this leaven still lingering among us. Probably not a great deal, avowedly. Increasing light has made it rather an object of amusement than of serious combat. These were, in all probability, conscientious men, who may have honestly thought they were doing God service. It was an error which had to die by the logic of events. Probably a good deal of a similar feeling, not so gross, lingers, unperceived by its possessors, in many minds. With all its outward appearance of peculiar zeal for the word of God, it was a thoroughly false position. Intelligent men dropped off from church. The minds of those who did attend were sadly uninstructed in both the doctrines and duties of religion. And the very infidelity to which it intended to place itself in direct and special antagonism, grew rank and thick around its path.

"The classics are very seldom referred to by the inspired writers." True. But the only one of them whom we know to have been acquainted with classical literature, the apostle Paul, twice quotes the Greek poets; once in his sermon at Athens, "As certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring;" and once in his Epistle to Titus, "One of themselves, even a prophet (*vates*—poet) of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies." In both cases it is for his own support, and not in condemnation of the books, that he makes the quotation.

The great revival of classical learning in Europe at the commencement of the sixteenth century, just as the Reformation was about to break forth, is an act of Providence to be deeply pondered. The name of Desiderius Erasmus cuts a very poor figure in the history of those times, if we

think of him as to the voluntary influence which he exerted on the great religious struggle of the day. He appears to be a sort of centaur, of half-human and half-bestial form. He is half reformer, and can laugh heartily at the superstitious prayers of the ship-load of papists to their saints when they are expecting shipwreck. But he still adheres to the papists, it would seem, from a mere disinclination to move. He can by no means advance with Luther to the full light of a simply scriptural religion. But considered as an involuntary instrument of Divine Providence to introduce classic learning just at that time, as a means of education, and as a preparation for the inspired word, just as a faithful company of those that publish it were about to spring up, Erasmus played a most important part. We can give him but little honor in the matter, except that he had the good taste to love and to patronize elegant letters. But he had little intention of benefiting Luther or the Reformation thereby. Never was there a figure in the drama of providence who saw less himself what he was doing, or who acted more for an end which he neither intended, desired, nor perceived.

The rise of the classic learning in Europe at that time was a most important and valuable preparation for the bursting forth of the word of God, and the outpouring of His Spirit, at the Reformation. If we have judged correctly, the classics, in the hands of Melancthon, Calvin, Lady Jane Grey, and a host of other eminent classical scholars of that day, of whom these are specimens, served exactly the part which they were designed by Providence to serve in the plan of redemption, that is, as instruments of the culture of the mind, to bring it to a higher, and clearer, and nobler ground of thought, and so nearer to the Gospel of Christ.

We should by no means shrink from a comparison of those writers who are the most classical with those who are the least so, or who are little so, as to all good influences

on the human mind from their writings respectively. In the great seventeenth century, Howe, Owen, Bates, and Baxter, were the princes of the pulpit of the one party, as men were then divided in religious opinion; South, Taylor, Barrow, and Tillotson, were the princes of the pulpit of the other party. Baxter was too deeply awed and impressed by the visions of eternity to deal much in literary charms. Tillotson was too much bent upon soothing the tempers of men, and withal too much of a politician, to be a very profound classical scholar. But the other three, on each side, are astonishingly replete with the riches of the classics. They have been found in many a library and in many a hand, in this generation, solely on that account. "South tells the truth with the tongue of a viper," as Richard Cecil says of him. Owen is devoted to the establishment of doctrinal truth by patient and persevering study, by all holy labor, and the deepest personal experience. Taking the other two, on each side, as more appropriately the writers of that day for after ages, Howe and Bates, Barrow and Taylor, what a wealth of classic learning they have embalmed by binding it about the sweetest and purest Christianity! How their lofty genius, especially that of JOHN HOWE and of JEREMY TAYLOR, revelled with the Greek philosophers and poets! How they lead the kings of the west, as the star led those of the east, to lay the richest of their gifts at the feet of Jesus Christ! Their pure religion is no doubt the highest element of the life of their writings. But their classic wealth lends no unimportant aid to their immortality.

As to the poets of our language, it may be questioned whether, in general, those who are most purely religious are not, also, those who are most thoroughly classical—Spencer, Milton, Cowper. Some one has said that Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire is a bridge over the gulf which divides the ancient history from the modern. So Spencer's Fairy Queen is a bridge,

with festoons of the most beautiful and fragrant flowers hanging over the parapet all the way, between the ancient poetry and the modern, leaving no one long to doubt that the poet is a Christian, even when he most luxuriates in the antique and the mediæval romance.

The exhaustless classic wealth of Milton in the productions of his youth, Comus, Lycidas, Arcades, L'Allegro, and Il Penseroso, can have escaped no attentive reader. To do the proof justice by quotations, would be to cite nearly the whole of these poems. There is, however, a passage in the Arcades, probably not so hackneyed to the common eye, which may be cited for its peculiarly Platonic spirit. It is in the speech of the Genius of the Woods, where he is telling what his business is in this world:

> "But else, in deep of night, when drowsiness
> Hath locked up mortal sense, then listen I
> To the celestial sirens' harmony,
> That sit upon the nine infolded spheres,
> And sing to those that hold the vital shears,
> And turn the adamantine spindle round,
> On which the fate of gods and men is wound;
> Such sweet compulsion doth in music lie
> To lull the daughters of necessity,
> And keep unsteady nature to her law,
> And the low world in measured motion draw
> After the heavenly tune, which none can hear
> Of human mould, with gross unpurged ear."

If it be thought that he does not carry his classic spirit with him into the productions of his riper age, and into those places where he speaks more distinctly of the things of revealed religion, we shall give two proofs to the contrary, taken almost *ad aperturam libri;* and which might be indefinitely multiplied. The one is from the fourth book of Paradise Lost, where he is describing the Garden of Eden. He says:

"Not that fair field
Of Enna, where Proserpine, gathering flowers,
Herself a fairer flower, by gloomy Dis
Was gathered, which cost Ceres all that pain
To seek her through the world; nor that sweet grove
Of Daphne by Orontes, and the inspired
Castalian Spring, might with this Paradise
Of Eden strive; nor that Nyseian isle,
Girt with the river Triton, where old Cham,
Whom Gentiles Ammon call, and Lybian Jove,
Hid Amalthea and her florid son,
Young Bacchus, from his step-dame Rhea's eye."

The other is from the Paradise Regained, when he is relating the setting of the Saviour on the pinnacle of the temple at Jerusalem by Satan, and the failure of that temptation:

"But Satan, smitten with amazement, fell.
As when Earth's son, Antæus, (to compare
Small things with greatest) in Irassa strove
With Jove's Alcides, and, oft foiled, still rose,
Receiving from his mother Earth new strength,
Fresh from his fall, and fiercer grapple joined;
Throttled at length in air, expired and fell:
So, after many a foil, the Tempter proud,
Renewing fresh assaults amidst his pride,
Fell whence he stood to see his victor fall:
And as that Theban monster that proposed
Her riddle, and him who solved it not, devoured;
That once found out and solved, for grief and spite
Cast herself headlong from the Ismenian steep:
So, struck with dread and anguish, fell the fiend."

Indeed, a pretty thorough classical reading is requisite to understand Milton's poetry. Admit that he says that

"The Ionian Gods, of Javan's issue, held
Gods, yet confessed later than heaven and earth,
Their boasted parents,"

were the fallen angels, come up to this world to escape their prison-house, and to obtain, after a sort, that worship as gods to which their wicked ambition led them to aspire

in heaven; admit that he puts into the mouth of Satan that splendid eulogy on the city of Athens, in the Paradise Regained:

> "Look once more, ere we leave this specular mount,
> Westward, much nearer by south-west; behold
> Where on the Ægean shore a city stands,
> Built nobly; pure the air, and light the soil:
> Athens, the eye of Greece, mother of arts;"

though the poet saw and admitted "the trail of the serpent" over all classic letters, as over every thing else here below, he put them to their proper and beautiful uses, to praise and to adore the higher truths of God. The classics are no doubt the productions of fallen human nature. Shall we reject them for that? We might as well refuse to admire the spring bloom of the orchards, because there is a worm at the root of many a tree; or the green forests in their thick robes of leaves, because in some rocky cliff beneath their shade a rattlesnake may lurk; or the smooth enamel of the meadow, because in some spot the grass may cover a viper; or the endless gorgeous glory of atmosphere and cloud, because there the quick cross-lightning is bred; or the ocean in its solemn roar, because sometimes its shores are lined with shipwrecks.

For the bard of Olney, all his readers know how he refreshed his tried and holy soul by a translation of Homer, and of pieces from Horace, and even by renderings of the cricket-chirpings of Vincent Bourne.

The opposition of good men to the classics, has probably sprung from confounding two different species of education—the natural, or secular, and the religious education. These two species of education flow side by side, while they are both located in the family. It is necessary to teach a child to spell and read, in order to teach him properly "the principles of our holy religion, as contained in the Scriptures and in the Catechisms." But when they leave this first divinely constituted seat of education, the Chris-

tian household, then they part, and go to two other divinely constituted seats of education, but very different ones. The natural education goes into the hands of the State, or the civil authorities; or, which is about the same thing, into the hands of voluntary neighborhood associations of parents, united to sustain particular schools. The religious education of the child, when he ceases to be under family training, goes to the Church, with its Bible class and its pulpit.

It is the duty of natural education to teach our children all wholesome knowledge, such as will both discipline and inform their minds—the civil authorities being ever conceded to have their eye on those things chiefly which will train up good and enlightened citizens—the mathematics, the classics, the practical sciences, all arts of reasoning, and all philsophies of life, or of truth. It is the duty of religious education to teach our children whatsoever God, in His revealed word, has commanded us—no more, no less; or, to express it otherwise, she must teach the "principles of our holy religion, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, of which the Catechisms are recommended as summaries." The Church has no right to control natural education; or, if she has a right at all, it is just such a right as she would have to control the food which a man might give his children. She might arraign him for inhumanity and barbarity, if it could be proved that a parent under her authority gave his child a stone for bread, a serpent for a fish, or a scorpion for an egg. But it would be a gross act of immorality, such a one as she ought to punish in connexion with any other duty, which the Church would judge of in this case. It would not be a particular scheme of education, of which she assumed to judge. It was the obvious and radical mistake of the parochial school movement, to assume for the Church a control over natural education, except as she always has controlled it, by breathing a healing breath, and diffusing an enlightened atmosphere

around it. She has as much right to err by defect, and refuse to teach the Epistle to the Romans, as she has to err by excess, and teach mathematics, or sciences, or classics. The Church, it is believed, actually suffered by the parochial movement. She has ever had an indirect, and just, proper influence on natural education, as she has a deep interest in it. Much of this she lost by the appearance of a spirit of open sectarian defiance in that movement. She can never be indifferent to the cause itself. The more education, other things being equal, the more peerlessly comes the word of God before the minds of men. The wider the circle of motive, the greater the power of truth.

Christianity, as it seems to us, abstains, every where in her revealed oracles, from meddling with the sphere of natural education. She does not teach the sciences. She gives no system of rules for the secular training of children; she commands them to no special trades or avocations. The truth is, that she takes the whole thing for granted, as the business and the duty of men acting in secular relations. She takes it for granted that every Christian parent will give his child the very best natural education which his means will command, just as she takes it for granted that every good and wise parent will guard the pecuniary interests, or the sight and hearing, or the general bodily health of his child. She leaves the parent himself to be judge of the best means of each.

The providence of God was preparing a wondrous and precious gift for man during the four hundred voiceless years between the cessation of the voice of the prophet Malachi and the awaking of that of the Baptist in the wilderness. It was, in another sense, preparing the way of the Lord. It was producing the best means of natural education; the most valuable ally of the sciences which were to rise after many centuries. It was giving birth to Euclid of Megara and the mathematics. It was rearing the gorgeous edifice of the Greek Tragedy, in which that great

cross to the proud mind, the coexistence of divine predestination and human freedom, receives a stronger corroboration than almost any where else in the grand and stately march of events on their predestined way, upon the wheels of the freest human choice, the merest human contingencies, the most unconstrained of human actions. The beautiful mythology was forming in that four hundred years. The philosophers were dreaming dreams which, though they contained very little objective truth, would yet enrich the imaginations of men for ever. Statues and pictures came into existence, which elevated the spirit of man, and have given it ideas of perfect beauty of form in all subsequent ages.

We deny the Church the right to legislate directly on the subject of secular education. But, so far as she can speak to her people as citizens, she ought to let her voice be heard at this time, (or as soon as the dark war cloud may, in the good providence of God, roll away from us,) calling aloud for a deeper infusion of classical learning into the mind of the coming generations.

There was an education meeting held at Augusta, Georgia, one evening during the sessions of our General Assembly in that city last December, to discuss the subject of a higher education among our people. It was not a meeting of the Assembly at all, but of such friends of education as might and did willingly come together, chiefly composed of persons brought there by the sessions of that body. Nor was it a meeting held on the subject of the education of indigent students for the ministry. The plans of the meeting seemed to crystallize in the form of a University for the South, of a non-Episcopalian type, and to give a more thorough education than those now in existence. The adjourned meeting was not held, as appointed, at our General Assembly in May last past, for obvious reasons. We hope it will not be forgotten, when future opportunity shall offer.

The Presbyterian church can say, with far more truth, and with a far deeper meaning than the ambitious poet:

> "I must run glittering in the sunshine or I am unblest."

Learning must ever be her indispensable ally. She has never undervalued piety in the ministry. "The Bible, the Bible alone, the religion of Christians," has ever been her maxim. She has maintained the importance of sound doctrine to a holy life, with a faithfulness quite as strenuous as has been shown by any of her loved and respected sister churches. But she has never slighted the classics. She never dreaded that her children would be wiled away from the great and dread Jehovah, and His loving, and dying, and glorified Son, and all the holy grandeurs of revealed truth, by the beautiful toy Jupiters, and Apollos, and Minervas, of the classic mythology. She has ever nurtured herself deeply and richly with the Grecian letters. We trust that she will continue to do so; that she will make her escape from all fanatical ideas on the subject of education. We trust she may revise several of her plans in this general connexion; so that when she presents herself to God for a renewed and richer baptism of the Holy Ghost, it may be that both then and thereafter she shall purpose and resolve a deeper possession of all valuable and all elegant human learning, with which to serve Him and to adorn His doctrine.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1862.

PLACE OF MEETING.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America convened in the city of Montgomery, Alabama, on the first day of May, 1862, in the elegant Presbyterian church of which the Rev. Dr. Petrie is the pastor. The regularly appointed place for the meeting of this Assembly was Memphis, Tennessee; but the presence of hostile armies, on the eve of battle, near that city, the difficulties and hazards necessarily existing to prevent its hospitable homes from being reached by the ordinary channels of travel, and the preoccupation of the minds of its citizens by the demands of their own private affairs or by the wants of the numerous sick soldiers thrown upon their sympathies, rendered it altogether inexpedient to attempt a meeting there. Accordingly, the Moderator of the last Assembly notified the Presbyteries of the propriety of a change of place, and requested them to appoint their Commissioners in view of a meeting at Montgomery. The Clerks were desired to issue their proclamation, directing the Assembly to meet in accordance with this change. There was a universal acquiescence in the wisdom of the alteration; and a precedent was thus, we presume, established for the future government of the officers of the Assembly when placed in similar circumstances.

ORGANIZATION.

The Rev. Dr. B. M. Palmer, the Moderator of the last Assembly, was unable to be present, greatly to the disappointment of the Commissioners and the citizens of Montgomery. He had reached Mobile, on his way to the Assem-

bly; but the startling intelligence of the fall of New Orleans overtook him there; and he felt it to be his duty to retrace his steps immediately, that he might place himself in the ranks of the defenders of his country at a point where the most effective blows might be directed against the invaders of his home. In his absence, the Rev. J. L. KIRKPATRICK, D. D., was unanimously chosen to preach the opening sermon, and to preside until the new organization should be effected. His admirable discourse, and his dignified presidency during the period required for the usual opening formalities, pointed him out as the fitting Moderator of the Assembly, to which honorable office he was accordingly elected, without the opposition of a second nomination. The Rev. T. L. MCBRYDE, D. D., was unanimously chosen Temporary Clerk.

It ought to be added, in connexion with this, that there was another absence deeply regretted: that of the Stated Clerk, the Rev. Dr. JOHN N. WADDEL, who was detained at home by the exigencies of the war. The Rev. E. T. BAIRD, D. D., was elected to act in his stead during the sessions of this Assembly.

THE ATTENDANCE, ETC.

As was to have been expected, the number of Commissioners in attendance was small. The occupancy of the line of the Mississippi river by the enemy, rendered it unadvisable for the Arkansas brethren to attempt to be present. There was but *one* delegate from Texas, who, a chaplain in the Army of the West, was providentially enabled to attend, on his way to join his regiment. There were but *two* from the Synod of Memphis: the seat of active war lying between their homes and Montgomery. From the Synod of Mississippi there were *three;* one of whom was the Secretary of Domestic Missions, who had made his escape from New Orleans a few days before the enemy took possession. The other Synods were well represented by ministerial Commis-

sioners; the blanks in the roll being chiefly in the column of ruling elders. In all there were thirty-one ministers and sixteen ruling elders, making an humble total of forty-seven: this being considerably less than half of the whole number who had been elected to attend. These faithful brethren, however, constituted a highly respectable representation of the Church, and entered upon the discharge of their duties with godly seriousness, and under a deep feeling of peculiar responsibility. The general determination was, to transact the business with prompt straightforwardness, and with a minimum amount of speech-making. There was also manifested a purpose to dispose only of the indispensable routine of subjects which necessarily occupied the docket, and to suffer the introduction of as little new matter as possible; leaving the greater matters of Church policy for future Assemblies, to be more numerously attended in more peaceful times. Such a proof of wisdom ought to entitle this body to a place in the succession under the qualification of the "*prudent*" Assembly.

COMMITTEES CONTINUED.

It will be seen, in the published Minutes, that several important committees, appointed at the Augusta Assembly, were continued. Such was the Committee on the Revision of the Form of Government and Book of Discipline; it having appeared that, owing to the disturbed condition of the country, and for other less potent causes, the chairman (Dr. Thornwell) had been unable to convene its scattered members at any time during the four months which intervened between the meetings of the two Assemblies. It is certainly to be hoped that this highly important committee will be enabled to meet at an early day, to fix upon such propositions of revisal as they may deem wisest, and publish the result of their labors for the benefit of the several Presbyteries, in which courts the whole subject ought to be discussed, not later than next spring. Thus may we be

able to secure final action, at no distant day, touching matters which are both vital and difficult of settling. We do not plead for *haste*, indeed, but for *promptitude*. And, doubtless, the distinguished chairman and all the members of this long-standing committee, will soon be in a situation to satisfy the expectations of the Church, by taking definite action on all the points of change at issue. Many of these points, we may remind our readers, have already been elaborately discussed, in the pages of this Review and elsewhere. But we need to have a fuller, or at least a more general, discussion of them all in our lower church judicatories, for the benefit of numbers of church officers, who have as yet paid but little attention to the subject.

The committee to prepare a pastoral letter on the "Religious Instruction of the Colored People" was also continued. It is to be regretted that there was a necessity for this. There are many powerful reasons why the action of this committee ought not to be long postponed. Now that the churches are generally awaking to a profound feeling of the importance of a trust committed anew to their fidelity by the separation of the slave States from the free; now that the providence of God is distinctly calling upon all our people to do their utmost in behalf of the spiritual improvement of millions of dependents in their own homes, who have been rudely cast off from the intelligent sympathies of all the world besides; now that it is to be demonstrated that the institution of slavery, as understood and cherished in the Southern Confederacy, is open to objection only on the ground of certain abuses, all of which can be softened or entirely removed by allowing Christianity to have full sway in its developement and management: *now*, especially, it seems to us, should the minds of God's children in this country be authoritatively instructed with reference to duty in these important premises. We would, therefore, have been delighted to see the letter, which the aforenamed committee was directed to

prepare, placed at once before the Church and the world, that the mighty work whose prosecution it is intended to enforce, might be entered upon with all the light which Scripture and conscience, which considerations of patriotism, humanity, and necessity, can throw upon this prominent path of Christian enterprise. We are, however, aware of the difficulties that stood in the way of the committee, and which, during the last four distracting months, rendered the proper discharge of their duty almost impossible. We trust that the delay will prove a blessing in the end, by securing a more thorough investigation and a more complete presentation of the whole subject, on the part of the committee, which will now have abundant time to mature a historical paper upon a theme that may well burden the most gifted minds and tax the most ready pen. Besides, the timely publication of the eminently faithful and judicious address of the Rev. Dr. C. C. Jones, in our various religious newspapers, has contributed largely to fill up a gap which the report yet to be made will, we hope, completely remove.

Whilst speaking of the continuation of committees, it is germain to say a word with respect to those committees of the first Assembly which were directed to procure charters for the trustees of this body from certain of our State legislatures. It was hardly to be expected that the gentlemen charged with this duty would be able to make satisfactory reports touching a matter which is placed out of their control, in great part, by the necessary delays of legislation. But it would, doubtless, have been highly gratifying to the Assembly, if they had found it convenient to communicate *some* information on the subject. They might have reported, at least, what they found they could *not* do, and what they had reason to believe would be the final result of their applications for charters under the laws of the States respectively solicited. An informal note (privately directed) was, indeed, read to the Assembly, whose

brief contents stated simply the fact that the Legislature of Virginia had rejected the application to pass the bill adopted at Augusta. None of the reasons which governed this rejection were given. It was also incidentally communicated that the bill in question had been passed by the Legislature of Tennessee; but of this there was no reliable assurance. We do think that this neglect on the part of these committees, (although partially excusable in view of those circumstances of the country which drew off their attention as citizens to national affairs,) is to be lamented, we had almost said reprehended. It compelled the Assembly to take new action. Feeling the importance of the subject, it was deemed necessary to raise another committee, to whom was referred the entire matter, as stated in the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed, whose duty it shall be to secure all necessary information as to the forms of charters, and the conditions of securing them in the several States where they may be required, and report the same to the next General Assembly; and also that the committees appointed by the last Assembly be requested to report the result of their efforts to this committee.

Pending the passage of this resolution, a discussion arose, led by the Rev. Dr. Baird, (chairman of this new committee of five,) whose remarks showed great familiarity with the subject of charters, and who took occasion to characterize as absurd the bill which the last Assembly had prepared with so much care, and finished with the hand of so much legal learning. It would seem to be a pity that Dr. Baird had not been present at Augusta last December, to have added the light of his knowledge to that of Chancellor Johnstone, Judge Shepherd, and a galaxy of forensic stars besides. As it is, however, it is evident that this subject of charters will have to be discussed on the floor of the next Assembly; for the new committee will doubtless feel itself authorized to bring another form of bill, charged with important modifications of the present one. The vital point in the existing bill has reference to the attempt

therein made (we think successfully) to combine in one great corporate body the various agencies of the Church, so that there will be a strict unity in the practice, as well as the theory, of our ecclesiastical government. And if this central idea of the charter must be abandoned, according to the desires of some, other reforms will be necessarily made, which must seriously alter the character of our "Executive Committees," and lead to their being remodelled, somewhat according to the pattern of the old and offensive "Boards."

REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

A large portion of the time which the Assembly allowed itself for deliberation was occupied in listening to, discussing, and approving the reports on Foreign Missions and Domestic Missions: these being the only two reports which were presented from the Executive Committees. That on Publication was received by the Permanent Clerk in time to be embodied with the other valuable matter of the Appendix; and that on Education, although ready for the Assembly, was, by no fault of any one, never sent to that body. The respected Secretaries, the Rev. Dr. William Brown and the Rev. Dr. John H. Gray, were both prevented from attending the sessions at Montgomery, greatly to the regret of all concerned. The Assembly enjoyed, however, the presence of the Rev. Dr. J. Leighton Wilson, Secretary of Foreign Missions, and of the Rev. Dr. John Leyburn, Secretary of Domestic Missions, the former in his official character only, the latter as a member as well. The reports which these two brethren presented richly deserved the close attention given to them by the Assembly, and will far more than repay a careful perusal on the part of members of the Church. It is unfortunate, speaking from a worldly point of view, that our Foreign Missionary field has been shut off from the Committee by the enemy who is ravaging the banks of the Mississippi. But

it may turn out for the best. Meanwhile, the Committee is resolved to strain every effort to fulfil the Church's mission in the promising field so lately flourishing with all the evidences of Divine favor. The Missionaries among the Indians are not likely to suffer, if human energy, directed by the grace of God, can prevent it. They are already supplied for several months to come. As to Domestic Missions, the Executive Committee appointed by the Assembly is quite broken up by the fall of New Orleans into the hands of our wicked foe; the Secretary is a refugee in Athens, Georgia; and his *ad interim* advisers consist of the brethren in the ministry and in the eldership immediately about him. Dr. Leyburn is not the man to suffer this great cause to languish, if industry, zeal, and experience, can prevent.

OTHER DOCUMENTS OF THE ASSEMBLY.

A capital review of the state of the Church is to be found in the Narrative, prepared with remarkable care by the Rev. Mr. Girardeau, of Charleston. The Assembly wisely ordered it to be read to the churches from our various pulpits. Both the Narrative of last year, written by the venerable Dr. Leland, and that of this, are fair specimens of what such public papers ought to be: well worded, chaste, fervent, instructive, discriminating.

The reports of the different Standing Committees present nothing requiring special remark. That on Systematic Benevolence, written by the Rev. A. A. Porter, of Columbia, is deserving of attention, as presenting a condensed view of a subject whose importance can not be overrated, lying, as it does, at the foundation of all our benevolent enterprises.

The letter of Dr. Leyburn, written by him as chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, addressed to the President of the Confederate States, contains a straightforward, manly plea in defence of the Sabbath against the

incursions of godless army regulations. It will not do much good, however; inasmuch as statesmen, even the wisest of them, have yet to learn that to govern a country successfully requires obedience on the part of the governing powers themselves to the plain laws of Heaven. They act as if politics were wholly independent of, if not wholly above, religion. History is full of this error, especially as it relates to *Christian* countries; for the heathen have always maintained a controlling regard for the commands of their gods in all their laws and institutions.

A highly interesting "Pastoral Letter" was prepared by the Rev. Dr. Baird, chairman of a special committee, appointed for this purpose. It is addressed "To the Ministers and Members of our Churches, and Young Men of our Congregations, in the Confederate Army." It was ordered to be printed in the Appendix to the Minutes, and to be published in tract form by the Executive Committee of Publication. It must be useful; although we think that its utility would have been enhanced if the author had submitted it to a greater pressure of condensation. We hope that the Lord will bless it to those for whom it is intended!

We are pleased to see that the Assembly did not think that it went out of its way in recommending the Bible Society of the Confederate States to "the favor and patronage of our churches and people." This Society, located in Augusta, Georgia, is now energetically engaged in publishing, from stereotype plates, a large edition of the New Testament, and of the New Testament and Psalms, specially adapted to the use of soldiers. It can not want for patronage, for it is eminently deserving of it. As soon as the blockade shall have been removed, it will import largely from England such editions of the Bible and Testament as will fully meet the wants of all classes of our population.

The Assembly adjourned after a session of only four days. It did its work well, and left undone much that it felt itself unauthorized to attempt.

ARTICLE V.

HYMN-BOOK MAKING.

The determination of our first General Assembly to revise the Hymn-Book has called out a vast amount of writing on the subject. A great many good things have been said, of course; much talk on the part of a sensible people on any point necessarily includes a certain proportion of good sense. But so much of incongruity and opposition has appeared, as to show that no settled principles of reason or of taste have prevailed among us; and to show the need of some investigation for their discovery. Some thing will be accomplished by this article, if only the thought and purpose to determine these ruling principles be introduced into the mind of the Church. For we will never doubt that that mind, tuned as it is to spiritua melody, and enlightened from on high, can rise to the height of worthy praise, and worship God acceptably, not only in the spirit, but also in the manner of the worship.

Two principal questions suggest themselves, which being clearly answered, all other problems are either solved by implication, or concern the mechanism of the work. They are: the proper subjects of hymns; and the necessary requisites of good hymns. For if we can decide of what things they should treat, and in what manner they should treat of them, the work of selection will proceed easily under those two great lights.

The first question, which relates to the proper subjects of hymns, can best be approached by asking another: What part of their worship can Christians sing? This brings us at once to inquire of the spirit of lyrical composition, in which general division hymns occur as a class.

What does the world sing? Rather, of what does it not sing? Singing is the purling of the stream of life, whether

a rill leaps swiftly and starrily from the mountain, "making sweet music with th' enamelled stones," or the abounding river whispers kindly to the reeds, or thunders with many voices in the cataract. Every thought that has a thrill of emotional life in it; every feeling that mere words will not suffice for, which, spoken, leaves the heart still burdened with its sweetness or its woe, demands a voice in poetry and a hearing in song. We are not concerned with the mere lyrical shape of the poetry, but with the instinct that demands such shape as to be sung. And, discarding every other part of the subject, we look to see what men have loved to sing.

1. (*a.*) Addresses to loved ones, maidens wooed or won, parents, children, and friends.

(*b.*) Utterances of feeling concerning them; delight or lamentation, praise or dirge, exulting and complaint, all find a voice.

2. (*a.*) Addresses by prosopopœia to nature or country, to mountains, to the daisy, to the sea, to native land, or ocean isles.

(*b.*) Songs out of our own hearts about them, patriotic and other.

3. Historic lyrics; due to wars, victories, public disasters, or deliverances.

4. Songs born of society, or social relations and phenomena; farewells, good-nights, student glees.

5. Heart songs; one's own inner hopes, and joys, and fears, poured forth as King David begins his forty-fifth Psalm: "My heart bubbles up (like a spring) with pleasant song."

Putting aside as irrelevant so much of lyrics as is satirical or comic, we have the varieties of song before us. And what a precious and delightful thing it is, that while there is a world of thought to be uttered in words, and a world of feeling, which can not be spoken, God should give us this border land of song, beyond mere words, but

rich in voice. "Music married to immortal verse," is the consummation of human speech: the tenderest voice of love, the noblest balm of inward sorrow. The best outlet of the heart surcharged with joy in nature, or with patriotic fervors, or with victory, or with worship, is in song.

Such being the range of lyrics, and such the instinct of man's heart about song, the question next to be considered is: What limits, within this range, are imposed on our worship in hymns? It is self-evidently desirable that such variety as is not inconsistent with its nature, or with the high proprieties of religious life, should be sought; not only to avoid monotony, and consequent weariness, but because, the subjects being inexhaustible in depth, range, and beauty, and the attitude and temper of man's heart varying continually, there is a freshness, and richness, and power of Christian song, not attained, but to be approached, and climbed at, and soared for, with ever new delight and benefit. Indeed here, as in every other lofty department of human life, this is a distinct and signal part of the blessing; the perennial, spontaneous, self-rewarding endeavor after results worthy of God.

No limitations are to be taken for granted, therefore. No hasty assumption that the object of psalmody is this or that, can be permitted to narrow its field of utterance. We must look for boundaries to the standing instinctive judgments of the Church, or to the monumental example of Scripture—the Book of Psalms.

In treating of the instinctive decisions of the Church, we have two or three witnesses to bring forward. First of all, if we could discover them, would stand the precedents of the apostolic period. The dewy morning of the Christian day had its own matins, before science or fashion tuned the lay. Whatever we could find of that time, that opening worship of the Æonian Sabbath, would at least show us, beyond controversy, what must not be excluded; while it could not forbid that which was justified or suf-

ficiently endorsed elsewhere. Now, while it behooves us not to speak too confidently where we have not proof, there is a probability, more and more widely admitted by commentators, that certain quotations of the apostle Paul, introduced by the words, "Faithful is the saying," are taken from favorite hymns of the churches in his day.

However sceptical any reader may be on this point, certainly the possibility of their having such an origin must awaken the tenderest interest, and will justify a moment's pause upon them. And it is worthy of remark, that they all occur in the pastoral epistles. Addressed to intimate friends, where his heart had full play of personal affections, they show what was his manner of speech and thought in his least guarded moments. In them we seem to get a glimpse of what Paul's style of conversation was, fulfilling his own motto, εν τουτοις ισθι, pithy, full of counsel and apothegm, and relieved of all hardness by affectionate phrase, burning doxology, and snatches of unformed but sacred song. A most tempting theme verily; but we must not digress.

The first of these quotations is found in 1 Tim. 1 : 15: "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation; 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.'" How happily it fits the reference he is making to his own case; how vividly it brings him before us, joining in the simple but profound ascriptions to Christ of his chosen work, and thrilling with the feeling that he, above all men, should bear witness to Him!

The next occurs in chapter 3 : 1: "Faithful is the saying, 'If a man seeks the office of a bishop, he desires a good work.'" To us, perhaps, a bald truism, though it should not be, even now. But then, to be a bishop was to be first on Nero's list, or Pliny's, (and it made very little difference whether it were a Nero or a Pliny,) first in toils, and dangers, and contempts, and death, without earthly reward.

Plain as it is, then, there is a touch of heroism there, not unworthy of apostolic song.

The closing verse of the same chapter, though not introduced by the same formula, is thought to be of the same class: "Great is the mystery! 'God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.'" What a mass of wrought gold! Nothing formal or creed-like about it, but the whole story of a Divine Redeemer's love and power, pressed into five syllables, and chanted (perhaps in the close of their sacramental worship) by those to whom He was all.

The next chapter, 4 : 9, returns to the formula: "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation; 'For to this end we endure labor and reproach, because we have set our hope on the living God, who is the Saviour of all mankind, specially of the faithful.'" Very pleasant is it to mark this freshness of a true heart, this self-devotion, this reinforcing of each other's fortitude amid scorns and persecutions, in the first Christian hymns. We seem to breathe the same air with martyrs and confessors while we ponder these words.

The single quotation in Titus, 3 : 8, brings up Pliny's letter at once. "Faithful is the saying, 'Let them that have believed in God be careful to practise good works.'" These might be the very words with which their covenant began, whereby they "bound themselves, not to the commission of crimes, but to refrain from theft, from adultery; to be faithful in performing their promises, to withhold from none the property intrusted to their keeping."

One more example remains, viz: 2 Tim. 2 : 11–13; perhaps the most touching and beautiful of them all. "Faithful is the saying, 'For if we have died with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He will also deny us; if we be faithless, yet He abideth faithful; He can not deny Him-

self.'" This may not be poetry, in strictness of speech; neither is

"Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled:"

but it is certainly lyrical in a very high degree. It is difficult even now to read it, without a stirred heart and moistened eye; but think of the fierce days, the ranks of believers broken, perhaps even since the last Sabbath, by some sudden onslaught of persecution; the plain raiment and homely faces of poverty at Philippi or Thessalonica sublimed by sorrow bravely borne, or transfigured by the vivid purpose to suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together: and its pathos and simple eloquence, stand first, perhaps, among all the hymns of the Christian ages.

If, now, we review them, to note their subjects, we find the first and third to be songs of praise—the latter, praise in rather a didatic form; the second contains, possibly, a trace of ecclesiastical psalmody—certainly a word of honor to the chosen chief of the Church; the fourth, an utterance of patient faith; and the remaining two challenge to virtue, and hope, and joy.

We turn next, for a moment, to the actual selections of the Church through later ages—the hymns that successive generations of believers, untrammelled by authority, have loved and sung. And perhaps the very first that would occur, which are not versions of the Psalms, are two of Luther's, "A strong mountain is our God," which is praise and heroic faith; and, "In robes of judgment, lo! He comes!" lofty description and exhortation. And if, without further delay, we call up that noble choir of the time of Wesley and the following generations, and run over in our thoughts those of their hymns that every body knows, we shall find three great classes: Worship, Contemplation, and Self-Utterance. But the great body of those hymns which directly address the Deity are borrowed, more or less directly, from the Book of Psalms. A few would be found, even in these days, which address the sinner or the

saint; but their number then, as compared with those of the classes named, would bear a very small proportion to their number now, under the same comparison. The bulk of popular new hymns now, is divided between contemplation and addresses to the two great and final divisions of mankind—those who are Christ's, and those who are not.

Nor is this appeal to the instinct of the Church, or rather to her affections, a trivial and unworthy appeal. Sacred song, as we have acknowledged, is the outlet of sacred feeling. We, who believe in the indwelling of the Spirit, believe that the Church, as a whole, is ordered in heart and temper from on high. The emotions that swell within her bosom, and seek expression in her voice, are due to those tender and sublime objects of thought which are represented by the word of God and a God-given experience. And it will not do to say that these words, whatever their form may be, in which her heavenly hopes and joys, her challenges to living triumphs or more glorious deaths, her pledges of eternal loyalty, have spoken all her heart, are ill chosen, unworthy, untrue. The hymn the Church loves must be sung, whatever a finical taste or languid criticism may think of it.

But we revert, for a moment, to the Book of Psalms—God's own exemplar of Christian song. In a rapid, and not very accurate manner, which is all our particular purpose demands, we classify them as follows:

I.	Addresses of Praise, about	18
II.	Other forms of Praise,	32
III.	Christian Experience,	21
IV.	Christian Meditation,	19
V.	Prophetic Psalms,*	9
VI.	Patriotic Psalms,	19
VII.	Prayers Proper,	32

*It is by no means intended to limit the prophetical element to these nine or ten of the Psalms; but as we are concerned with their relations to worship, we have merged them, as far as possible without violence, in the

This survey has doubtless sufficiently illustrated the breadth of theme that must be permitted to a book of pious song. Nor can it be right (let us say in passing) to draw any very rigorous distinction between hymns for public and for private use. There is no real difference between the worship we offer as individuals and as a congregation; and while hymns may often, and properly, take cognizance of the fact that the people are "met together in Christ's name," it is not indispensable that they should do so. Could five, out of all the readers of this Review, be persuaded to omit "Rock of Ages" from our book, because it runs

"Rock of Ages cleft for *me*"?

The results of this cursory survey abundantly annul the canon, which has some how found footing, that all hymns should be praise. A proposition upon its very face impossible to be received; and yet, how many eminent men invariably introduce their reading of a hymn by the formula: "Let us sing to the praise of God," whether it be the one hundredth Psalm, or

"Oh, for a glance of heavenly day!"

How many arguments and disquisitions about psalmody rest their whole weight on the assumption that singing is praise! How many solemn appeals to choirs and to lovers of sacred music are vitiated by the same fallacy! No hymn-book can be limited to hymns of praise, or bound to any narrower range of themes than the emotions of the Christian life. This, we think, we have clearly proved.

---

other classes. That is to say, just fifty Psalms, or one-third of the whole book, consist of addresses to God, (I. and VII.) About forty speak mainly of God and His attributes, and wondrous deeds, done or to come, (II. and V.) Forty more utter the devout emotions and inward experience of a Christian heart, (III. and IV.) And the remainder are love, and glory, and grief about Israel, (VI.)

And in proving that, we have also settled the question whether a small collection would answer the purposes of the Church. If David, pouring the worship of ancient Israel into song, needed more than a hundred Psalms wherein to express it, when the feelings and circumstances of the Church were simplicity itself, compared with the present age, and if prophets and holy men were inspired to add to the number, down to the very close of the ancient canon, is it likely that fifty or a hundred hymns will content the people now? And where are all our objections to the meagreness of a liturgy, if the hymns that can be printed on a dozen pages will suffice for our singing? If there were any part of worship which would bear those narrow limitations, it would surely be the public prayers, whose round of proper subjects is so small, and whose treatment so circumscribed by the necessities of the ordinance itself. But, as even here liturgies breed leanness, *a fortiori* are narrow limits inadmissible in psalmody, which is prayer, and praise, and meditation, and longing, and a thousand other throbs of the true heart, and melodies of the loving voice.

Perhaps it will be as easy to dispose of the much-mooted matter of doctrinal hymns at this point as at any other. It is said, and truly said, that the didactic and lyrical elements are so opposite to each other, that virtually they are destructive of each other; that to state, and much more, to argue, a theological proposition, makes the so-called hymn in which it is done, a solecism and an absurdity. This can not be denied, and it certainly rules out a number of "hymns" that have been foisted into our present collection for no other discoverable reason than that they are rhymed digests of Calvinism. We confess we never meet them without a two-fold indignation; first, at the discredit to the hymn-book and to the Church which endorses and publishes it; and still more at the imputation on Calvinism, that it needs any such setting forth, needs to

be exhibited in any such pills of doggerel to be taken by the Church.

Such is hymn one hundred and twenty-two—a summary of doctrine, (save the mark!)

> "Election! 'tis a word divine:
> For, Lord, I plainly see,
> Had not Thy choice prevented mine,
> I ne'er had chosen Thee."
>
> "For perseverance, strength I've none."
>
> "O may Thy glorious merit be
> By imputation mine."
>
> "Free grace alone can wipe the tears
> From my lamenting eyes."

See, also, hymn forty-four:

> "Backward, with humble shame, we look
> On our original;
> How is our nature dashed and broke
> In our first father's fall!"

Others there are, but these are surely enough to show the futility of attempts in that kind. How odd a blindness it is, which can not see that doctrine is only truth in stiff, professorial raiment: that the hymn,

> "There is a fountain filled with blood,"

has the doctrine of justification by faith as clearly and justly in it as any dogmatic treatise; and has it alive, while the treatise probably has it dead: that Wesley's noble translation,

> "Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness
> My beauty are, my glorious dress,"

commends the doctrine of imputation more mightily than he ever impugned it: that Charles Wesley was glorying in the saint's perseverance when he wrote,

> "How happy every child of grace
> Who knows his sins forgiven!"

than which there is hardly a better hymn to be found!

Every hymn is the utterance of a truth; but truth as held and cherished by the heart. Any attempt to present it otherwise in a hymn, spoils the hymn, and puts a bad flavor on the truth besides.

Under the second chief division of our subject there is little to be done, except to examine the tests which have been applied with intent to banish certain well-loved hymns from our book, because of alleged faults. One or two general remarks may save delay and digression farther on.

In the first place, then, we concede that mere popularity in past days is not a perfect criterion, because the public taste does change; on the whole, it is becoming refined. But prudery is not refinement.

Secondly, we maintain that the last polish of fastidious scholarship does not furnish a proper criterion; because judgment can not be committed to it without both restraining the liberty and forfeiting the sympathy of Christ's Church. A single illustration will settle that point. Suppose the admirable hymn,

"Jesus, lover of my soul,"

to which public exception has lately been taken—suppose that hymn, and all that equally offend the same taste, were stricken from our book; who does not know that all our churches, and nine-tenths of our ministers, would feel the loss severely—would feel that one of the most comforting and delightful elements of sacred song was snatched from them, *on a punctilio?* In the next paragraph we must argue the question now touched upon; now we are only concerned with the maxim, that the taste of the church must be paramount, and not that of the most exquisite critics.

Taking these two principles with us, we advance now to the dogma, that hymns must not be *erotic*. The word itself is equivocal; but the meaning of it in this connexion

doubtless is, that such language ought not to be used as is restricted to romantic attachments in its ordinary employment. A moment's thought will satisfy us that, stated in this general way, the canon can not be maintained. Otherwise, David must not say, "O God, thou art my God;" because we employ a like phrase of possession about our elect ones, whoever they may be: neither can the language be endured, "In Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for ever more." The forty-fifth Psalm, the Song of Solomon, some noblest and most precious passages of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, yea, of all the prophets, parts of Paul's Epistles, and of Revelations, must all be rooted out.

Nor must it be forgotten that God himself has chosen this very relationship, on which to found promises and to inculcate duty. "I will betroth thee unto me for ever," "Prepare as a bride adorned for her husband," "So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty." Such are some of His words. And it is a signal proof of the vital and victotorious power of religious ideas, that they have redeemed such words from being merely amatory, and conferred upon them an intent as pure as it is lofty; so that it is rather the lover who quotes them from the Bible, than God who borrows them from man.

Only when a certain lusciousness of speech is indulged, which is rather sensual than amatory, does the charge of erotism become serious.

> "Thou knowest I love Thee, dearest Lord,"

suggests nothing unworthy, though the language can not fail a little in reverence; but

> "I'll speechless clasp Thee in my arms,"

and

> "There He may caress thee,
> And call thee His bride,"

are offensively amatory. Nor does the proof in either case lie in our assertion, but in the fact that the hymn first quoted retains its hold upon the Church, while the others have lost their hold, and are hardly ever sung.

As to the beautiful hymn so often mentioned above, we are not clear that it is erotic at all. The only expressions that give color to the charge, are "Lover of my soul," and "Let me to *Thy bosom* fly." But was Mason "erotic," when he called Washington a lover of his country? Is it amatory to say that Newton was a lover of truth? The concluding words, "of my soul," evidently qualify the offending word, and convert it from an epithet into an affirmation, "Jesus, who dost love my soul." And as to the other word, followed as it is by the reference to storms and sorrows, it loses its amatory associations altogether, and remains only slightly objectionable, as unduly anthropomorphic. Here, again, our appeal is to the facts. Do we sing these words with sentimental languors, or with a strong sense of Christ's love and protection amid the waves of trouble?

Another instance of hypercriticism, in the same kind, is that upon the line,

"My God, my life, *my love*"!

He who, knowing that the Scripture saith "God is love," and that any thing may be called one's love, or passion, which absorbs his affections, is yet offended by that line, must certainly be of a very "erotic" turn of mind.

Another fault, which ought in almost every case to banish a hymn from use, is toying with a figure of speech, just as a pleasant play of fancy. The objection here, however, is not æsthetic, but moral. It is the evident lack of earnestness. Psalmody is the play of feeling, not of fancy.

Our failing space warns us not to dwell on this point, as other rules must be illustrated, or they will hardly be believed to need mention.

The language of hymns must not be vulgar; as in that nauseous line,

"Let us in Thy bowels sound."

Nor must the figure be far-fetched; as Watts' about the clouds,

"Those wand'ring cisterns in the sky";

and the Methodist Hymn-Book,

"Now, O my Joshua, bring me in";

and

"He shall prop your feeble knees."

Nor, of course, can any thing so quaint as to become ridiculous be endured. Of this we find a signal example in "The Hymns of the Church Militant:"

"Through tribulations deep,
The way to glory is;
The stormy course I keep,
On these tempestuous seas;
By waves and winds I'm tossed and driven—
Freighted with grace, and bound for heaven.

"If a dead calm ensues,
And heaven no breezes give,
The oar of prayer I use,
And try, and toil, and strive.

* * * *

"But when a heavenly breeze
Springs up and fills my sail,
My vessel *goes with ease*
Before the pleasant gale;
And runs as much an hour, or more,
As in a month or two before"!

And again, in Newton's unhappy hymn:

"The kine, unguided, went
By the directest road,
When the Philistines homeward sent
The ark of Israel's God.

"Lowing they passed along,
And left their calves shut up;
They felt an instinct for their young,
But would not turn or stop"!

Even an ill-used word will spoil a hymn: as,

> "I *contemplate* it can't be long
> Till He will come again."

And St. Bernard's magnificent hymn on the City of God is blemished by the line,

> "*Conjubilant* with song."

In a word, while literary finish is not the rule, yet violation of established taste is a fatal transgression. Hymns must be simple in language, clear and unforced in thought, born of a living heart, and of such rhythm that they can be sung without violence to the sense.

We come now, in the last place, to that vexed question; the version of Psalms. Shall we sing Watts? or shall it be Rouse? If not, what shall it be? We have left ourselves little more room than will announce our judgment, for which we can claim very little regard, unsupported by the reasons on which it is founded.

As to the first and fundamental question of liberty, we will not yield an inch; no, not to win a thousand churches. We had rather go off into the woods, and sing alone, than submit to any dictation here. In truth, this question never is touched without stirring a profound indignation among the people of God.

Next, as to any prescriptive right of David's Psalms to monopolize the singing of the Church; there is not one word of ordinance on the subject, nor any Scripture example of their being sung, which conveys the slightest sense of obligation, either as acknowledged then, or as holding now. Jehoshaphat did command the singers to sing,

> "Praise the Lord, for His mercy endureth for ever,"

which is probably intended to identify a psalm; but the circumstances were unique, and utterly unlike our congregational worship. And why should David, or the Psalms bound up with David's, we know not when, be enforced

upon us; and Isaiah, and Habakkuk, and the heavenly songs in Revelations, be ruled out? Why may we not sing,

"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain"?

But there is a gleam of light in the proposal to compile a new version; especially if it be coupled with the suggestion, not to separate it from the hymns proper, but to blend them together.

We freely concede both the defects and the demerits of Watts, though he be the best single paraphrast we have. His eighteenth psalm contains nothing so worthy as Sternhold and Hopkins',

"The Lord descended from above,
And bowed the heavens most high."

And several of the noblest Psalms he has rendered with unpardonable feebleness. Take, for instance, the thunder-psalm, the twenty-ninth. The key is found in verse third:

"The God of glory thundereth."

From the abrupter contrasts of mountain and valley, the larger proportion of water to the land, and the more varied weather, it seems probable, though we can not find it so stated in the books, that electrical phenomena are on a grander scale in northern than in southern Palestine; where, in truth, thunder and lightning are almost entirely confined to the winter months. Now, if we suppose David to have visited Carmel during the latter part of the summer, (and he may well have done so on military or other royal errand, after the harvests of the spring were gathered,) and imagine the sullen sweep of sulphurous clouds, spreading their shadow silently over the breathless sea; white masses rolled up, throne-like, above the gloomy crypts, the cloud-caverns, where fierce thunders already rumble; the mighty pile seeming to grow without voice, or hand, or breath of wind, out of the black deep into the very zenith; the sudden lightning, struck out, as it were, by a

blow of the mace of Power; the instant, crashing roar behind it, leaping out across the unclouded blue, while Lebanon and Hermon (which is Sirion) start on their lofty seats, and break the very cedars by the shock; making the great sea cower in its bed; and running southward across Samaria and the Holy City, until far-off Kadesh trembles with awe: if, we say, David be imagined to behold and hear all this from Carmel, we can almost *feel* the tremors of delight and worship with which he whispered softly,

> "The God of glory thundereth!"

and the sublime faith that turns the very thunder into the sweet music of promise,

> "Jehovah will give strength unto His people!
> Jehovah will bless His people with peace!"

And what of all this glorious picture has Watts given us? We really have not the heart to quote it; it is too pitiful beside the Psalm he should have rendered into verse.

It is, therefore, not only permissible, but has become necessary, that Watts' worse paraphrases should be stricken out, and that the whole world of Christian poesy be put under contribution, that at least an endurable version of the Book of Psalms be made out. And if no good account of any particular Psalm can be given, (as we believe is the case with this twenty-ninth,) *let it be left blank until its requisitions are met.* There could be no higher tribute to its power and beauty.

We have thus run, most slightly and unsatisfactorily, we confess, over the principal points to which we desire the minds of our best men to address themselves. There can be no exaggeration of the importance of the subject. Our children's worship, and thus their hearts and minds, are to be formed on the Hymn-Book, perhaps more, even, than on the Bible. Nor can we deny the multitude of good hymns now wanting in our present book, nor the many poor ones inserted there.

If we could embody every genuine and worthy Christian feeling in a song, whether the feeling spring from a view of precious truth, from God's gracious providence, or our inward life; if in language simple, fresh, clear, poetic, our congregations could utter all their heart, or warm the sluggish devotions of their worldliness into fervors and joy; if the venerable worship of the Bible-Church, pouring its streams through many ages, could flow, widening and deepening, in majestic music into the volume of our psalmody; then, indeed, our Hymn-Book would be made.

It is our duty to approach the excellence we can not attain.

ARTICLE VI.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF ABBEVILLE DISTRICT, S. C.

As early as 1765, a petition was sent up from the "Long Canes," in Upper Carolina, to the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, for ministerial aid. This section had been for about ten years filling up with descendants of the Scotch-Irish from North Carolina and Virginia, forming the "Calhoun Settlements;" so named from the distinguished civilian, Patrick Calhoun, Esq., who led the emigration, and who formed the nucleus of a very extensive family connexion, occupying, by this time, in its varied yet closely-interwoven branches, nearly all that region of country on the waters of Little River, afterwards known as the "Flat-Woods" of Abbeville.

The constant liability to Indian depredations, and the reckless habits engendered by border life, had rendered

impracticable the regular administration of the ordinances of religion, even if such had been obtainable. Indeed, so precarious had been the foothold of the first settlers, as to render them little else than sojourners on the fruitful soil they had determined to occupy. With the hardihood natural to their race, they had ventured upon the very hunting-grounds of the Indians; and dearly had they paid the forfeit of this temerity. From their primitive cabins, nothing but the wild beast and the savage roamed over these lonely streams and vales, which stretched away beyond the Unacaya mountains, to the Blue Ridge. Meditating a bitter revenge, the Cherokees made a descent, in 1761, upon the feeble colony; and, coming upon them in their attempted flight to the nearest point, Augusta, Georgia, they massacred between fifteen and twenty men, women, and children, and carried into captivity two little girls, daughters of Mr. William Calhoun, brother of Patrick. The elder of these was, after some years, rescued; the other was never heard of. The scene of the melancholy catastrophe is on a descent, just before reaching Patterson's Bridge. Attacked at the moment when they had stopped to make an encampment, and entangled by their wagons, they could make but little resistance. Some, however, were so fortunate as to make their escape. Cutting loose the horses, and favored by the night, they fled to the Waxhaws, with another portion of the company, which was in advance. Among the slain was the mother of the family, Mrs. Catharine Calhoun; and a curious stone, engraved by a native artist, marks the spot where she fell amidst her children and neighbors.

The severe measures of Grant, who in this year, with a Provincial regiment under Col. Middleton, advanced upon and devastated the Indian settlements, compelled the savages to maintain a show of peace for some years; and before 1765 the fugitives had all repossessed the homes they had abandoned. This state of security did not long

continue. The good faith of the Indians did not exclude predatory incursions, which kept the settlers in continual alarm; but though these were detrimental to peace and property, we do not learn that any others were sacrificed to the tomahawk.

In 1764, the colony was strengthened on its southern border by the arrival of the French Protestants, who had received a grant of land from the King of England, included in Hillsborough township, ten miles square, near the confluence of the Savannah and Little Rivers. In 1765, the fear of Indian invasion had extended to the French; and in addition to the forts already built, they constructed, for their own protection, one in New Bordeaux, and another in New Rochelle, a settlement on the eastern side of the river.

In addition to these, the intervening tract of country shortly received a number of accessions from Scotland, as the names still remaining testify; which, with the lawless and rude characters that naturally seek frontier life, made up at this time a pretty various and extensive population. No wonder that those religiously trained should begin to lament the absence of the sanctifying influences of a preached Gospel.

The neighborhood of the pious French could avail them nothing, except the hallowing influence of a holy and quiet example. Whilst the leader of the Scotch-Irish colony was hospitably extending to the indigent and expatriated Huguenots the friendly hand of civil laws, their ordinances and sacred rites, though hermetically sealed to him, under the exclusiveness of their foreign tongue, must have affectingly reminded him of that worship for which *his* fathers had sacrificed so much.

We may not suppose that, coming from under the teachings of such men as McKemie, Robinson, and others, these people could willingly suffer such a state of reckless indifference and forgetfulness of God to be impressed upon the

rising generation. Accordingly, again and again, a deputation was sent up to urge their necessities upon the Synod. Among the ministers appointed by this body, in 1769, to visit the Carolinas, was Mr. John Harris, then a member of the Lewestown Presbytery; and though it does not appear that his mission southward was fulfilled for nearly two years, there is no evidence that either of his co-laborers had before that time penetrated to the settlements then known as Upper (or rather Western) Carolina. On the contrary, it is asserted that the labors of Messrs. Roe and Close did not reach that section;* and whatever service might have been rendered by others was entirely transient in its character, until the arrival of Mr. Harris. In 1774, we find him a regular member of Orange Presbytery, which then embraced both the Carolinas, where he remained until, with five others, he was set off to constitute the first Presbytery of South Carolina, which met at the Waxhaws, April 11, 1785. But as early as 1773, he had formed a settlement in the "Flat-Woods," on the waters of McKinley's Creek and Little River; where, as a land-owner and planter, he bore no inconsiderable share of the losses and sufferings inflicted by the Indians and Tories.

Of the five preaching stations selected by the committee,† we can not certainly say that he occupied more than three,

* We are inclined to believe that there is some mistake in this statement. We have lying before us the copy of a report drawn up by Dr. Cummins, as a committee of the old Presbytery of South Carolina, to collect materials for the Church history of Abbeville county. This committee was appointed in 1793; the report was brought into Presbytery, and sent on to the Assembly in 1794. In this it is said that the Rev. Azel Roe and John Close, from New Jersey, tarried some weeks in the Long Canes settlement early in 1771, "ordained elders, and administered the Lord's Supper for the first time in all that land." Mr. Roe received an earnest and harmonious call to become their pastor, but the call was unsuccessful.—EDS. S. P. R.

† The movement to obtain the regular ministrations of the Gospel by the first settlers, was somewhat remarkable. Two of their number, Messrs. Russel and McAlpin, were sent to the Synod of New York and Philadelphia with a petition for supplies. Messrs. Roe and Close were appointed to

viz: "Upper Long Cane," "Lower Long Cane," and "Bull Town," or "Rocky River." We have reason to believe, however, that his missionary labors were indefatigable and zealous, and that he was ready to dispense the Word wherever at all practicable—under trees or in log cabins—and that he carried a word of encouragement or rebuke everywhere. An aged lady, born in 1769, not long deceased, gave, as one of her earliest reminiscences, the hearing him preach under a large chestnut tree near the residence of General Pickens, which was then the "block-house," on the site now occupied by Abbeville village. In this discourse he inveighed very strongly against the use of tobacco, and some other species of intemperance, affording thus a pretty good comment on the license which then prevailed.

Bold, enthusiastic, and independent, he was a man peculiarly adapted to the times, and to the work appointed him. Though not above the medium height, his sturdy frame and erect carriage commanded respect; and the serene, but honest determination of his countenance, tempered the pleasantries which often sparkled from his dark eye. Through the trying scenes of the Revolution, he labored energetically to stamp his own principles of republicanism, as well as those of his religion, upon his people. The three preaching stations before mentioned grew, under his care, to regularly organized churches about the close of

---

visit them. Upon the report of the delegates, on their return, those who sent them appointed a committee of five to arrange the people into congregations, that the labors of the missionaries might be facilitated. The committee were Patrick Calhoun, Andrew Pickens, John Irwin, —— McAlpin, and one other, whose name has not been handed down. The region of country in which the petitioners resided was arranged by the committee, it is said, in four (five?) congregations, and the places of preaching were appointed about fourteen miles apart. The names of these places were Rocky Creek, Upper and Lower Long Cane, (Upper Long Cane still retains its name; Lower Long Cane embraced what is now called Hopewell). The other two places were Bull Town (now Rocky River) and Saluda (now Greenville).—EDS. S. P. R.

the war, having been indebted to him not only for spiritual direction, but for his manly and patriotic example in the cause of freedom.

It was the usual boast of this Christian patriot, that *every* man in his congregation was a Whig; but though the Scotch-Irish "were of the right stamp," there were many who wore the "red coat" in the surrounding country; and the vicinity of the Savannah River rendered it necessary for the well-affected to seek protection in forts against marauding parties from the Georgia side. Much of his catechetical and other instruction had to be given in these forts, which were scattered along the Savannah River, or in those nearer his preaching stations, which had been built for protection against the Indians. About three miles from the spot where the church was afterwards built, called Hopewell, a palisade fort, with port-holes, and supplied within with a school-house, minister's residence, and other log dwellings, had been constructed, on the return of the settlers to their homes. It was called Fort Boone, most probably in honor of Thomas Boone, then Provincial Governor. The father of the Rev. Dr. Gray, now of LaGrange, Tennessee, and the venerable lady before mentioned, his sister, were pupils in the school at Fort Boone, and catechumens of the Rev. John Harris.

On account of his republican zeal and influential character, he was particularly obnoxious to the Tories, and was often obliged to fly before them, when, on errands of mercy, he had gone forth alone, taking refuge for the time in canes or thickets. Not being able to lay hands on him, they revenged themselves on his property, driving off at one time nearly all his slaves to Florida. It will be remembered that the British held at that time a depot there for *such* property.* At "Bull Town" was a fort, in the

* "The British philanthropists formed a plan, in 1787, of settling at Sierra Leone a company of slaves, who had (*deserted*) to the British army, and accompanied the troops on their return to England."—Rev. Dr. Van Renssalaer.

vicinity of the plantation of the Rev Mr. Harris, where the Tories and Indians deployed most successfully in their nefarious system of plunder. An instance is given of a negro woman, belonging to Mr. Harris, who was chased by them for three days, with her child in her arms; she was at length caught and conveyed to the Indian Nation, but made her escape, leaving her child behind. The child was finally rescued by Colonels Pickens and Anderson, and is still living.

Though the state of things was thus desperate, it need not be supposed that the assembling together of the congregation was entirely suspended. The conscientious worshippers of God often bowed upon their arms, and a credible tradition asserts that the Rev. John Harris often preached with his gun in the desk beside him, and with his ammunition suspended from his neck, after the fashion of the times. Neither intimidated by his perils, nor discouraged by his losses, he pursued his upright and independent course, apparently forgetful of self in his zeal for the interests of his people. A little anecdote will serve to illustrate his determination, as well as his weight of character. Col. A., a worthy man, but rather pliant in his temper, lived far down on the Savannah, in a region much exposed to Tory aggression. He was a personal friend of the minister, and a member of one of his congregations; but having held a commission under the royal government, it was feared that he would compromise his principles for British favor and protection. This suspicion no sooner entered the mind of his friend, than he mounted his horse, and, taking his saddle-bags for a long visit, determined not to leave him till he came out on the right side. He staid with him several days, and on his return declared "that all was right."

The Rev. John Harris was born of Welsh parents, who settled on the eastern shore of Maryland, early in the eighteenth century. Little is known of his early training,

but there are evidences of his classical knowledge still in the possession of his descendants: some of the theological works once belonging to his library are more than two hundred years old. We hear of him first as a member of New Castle Presbytery, in 1756, which being divided, he was set off to Lewestown. Whilst here, he preached in the ancient churches of Wicomico and Monokin, names familiar to the earliest records of the colonial church. He was remarkable for the industry, energy, and punctuality of his habits, and to an advanced age attended faithfully upon the church judicatories.

As an evidence of his position as a citizen, he was at one time a member of the Provincial Congress of South Carolina; and besides, in that frontier life, in the absence of regular physicians, was very useful to his people in a medical capacity: aged persons here remember that their *parents* spoke of him as old Doctor Harris, and tradition has preserved some instances of his efficiency in the healing art.

Although very genial and tolerant in his social proclivities, he was an uncompromising champion of the faith, and it was believed would not hesitate to demonstrate his belief in his principles, by physical as well as by mental power. At the close of the war, he was the only Presbyterian minister in the region known afterward as Abbeville District; but he had some thing of a competitor in a brother of the Associate Scotch Reformed Church, who, offended at the fearless independence of the Presbyterian, and at some innovations attempted in Psalmody,* often gave vent to sentiments more bellicose than Christian. It was said to him one day, "You had better take care, old Dr. Harris

* A son of Mr. Harris, a gallant and spirited youth, having learned something of music from an Englishman in Virginia, ventured to introduce Watts, and to give his father's congregations some new tunes to vary the routine of the *old Scotch dozen;* but received for his reward the usual amount of indignation from the conscientious psalm-singers.

will get hold of you." "I dinna care," he replied; "he may hae the better of me in hither and yan, but I hae the advantage in length." Such were the men of that rude and practical age. But in that strong domestic fabric was wrought the sternest patriotism, the most unflinching integrity. It is almost unnecessary to add that Mr. Harris was very popular, and by the dignity of his character and deportment commanded respect even from those whose principles and practices he opposed. During the last ten years of his life, he resigned his pulpits principally to the younger and more demonstrative preachers with whom the church was now supplied, acting as a co-laborer with them. The last pulpit he occupied was in connexion with Mr. Mecklin, at Rocky River.

As a pioneer in religion, and as a patriot, his work was done; the churches were organized, and the country established in peace. Having purchased some land on the Savannah, he was preparing to spend the remainder of his days in that comfort which contrasted strongly with his stormy middle age, when he was attacked with a pulmonary complaint, and gradually declined. He died in 1798 or '99, aged, it is thought, more than sixty-five years. He was brother-in-law of the Rev. Hugh Henry, of Maryland, having married Mary, the daughter of Col. Isaac Handy, a patriot of the Revolution, and descended from one of the first settlers of Somerset county, Maryland.

Not far from the road leading from Calhoun's Mills to Abbeville Court House, on a place owned by Mr. J. C. Calhoun, may be seen the debris of a stone wall, enclosing the remains of this worthy missionary, and those of his wife, who followed him in a few years.

A traveller, on the road leading from Charleston through the "Flat-Woods" of Western Carolina, might have passed near enough to hear the songs of praise issuing from the log building which first distinguished the church of Lower Long Cane. It was situated in the midst of a rich country,

on a level spot, in which the large trees stood up like columns in some mighty temple. It is a rather curious fact, that the land on which it stood was given by a colonist from Ireland, on the express provision that no grave-yard should be ever made there; a condition which has not been forfeited, except in the graves of two or three foreigners.

It was in this log house that the Rev. Mr. Harris preached with his rifle by his side; here he ordained the first elders, William Calhoun, Sr., and N. Barksdale; and here, as early as 1777, he baptized several infant children, who were afterwards elders in that same church. There is no doubt that the churches were first organized in these houses, for it was not until after the country was established in peace that the attention of the people could be effectively directed to the improvement of their religious edifices.

At "Bull Town" a large frame building succeeded the log house, and the name was changed to Rocky River; and in 1787, as the contract still in existence testifies, preparations were making for the erection of the commodious "meeting house" of Lower Long Cane, which was built on a rising ground on the opposite side of the road. Previous to this, a pastor had been called from among the young men now entering the ministry. On the 29th of July, 1785, a vast concourse of people assembled at Davis' Bridge, to witness the ordination and instalment of Mr. Robert Mecklin, into the pastoral charge of Lower Long Cane* and Rocky River. Such was the eagerness of the people to witness this ceremony, that it was deemed advisable to select a suitable spot *between* the two congregations; and there, in the rich cathedral of nature, the young Presbytery of South Carolina held its third meeting within the space of two months for this solemn and beautiful purpose. It had first received as probationers, from the Presbytery of Orange, three young men, Robert Hall, Robert Finley, and Robert

* It was not until 1788 that the place received the name of Hopewell.

Mecklin—the first of whom had been placed at Upper Long Cane—names that were destined to leave a fragrance of piety, not yet utterly lost to this region. This ordination was a "a scene which could never be forgotten," said one who was an eye-witness. And certainly it was a beautiful sight, after the terrors and turmoils of war, to behold two large congregations meeting peacefully and harmoniously in the exercise of their simple worship, which requires no "temple built with hands." No longer were to be seen the ominous stacks of muskets, nor the sentinel pacing to and fro with straining eye; there were no more palpitating hearts nor trembling nerves; but on the green sward, and under the rich shadow of the water oaks, were groups of happy children and happier mothers, whilst the serene and hopeful expression of the assembly, seated around on logs or puncheons, was nearly as sparkling as the limpid waters which flowed at their feet. But the most touching sight of all, was the appearance of the young candidate for holy vows, in whose countenance there must have been a peculiar sanctity and devotion, to have inspired his people with so much reverence, and to have given a presage of his early translation to a purer world. The fame of Mr. Mecklin as a preacher seems to have been contemporary with his ministry; and when, at the end of three years, God was pleased to remove him to the upper sanctuary, he was remembered with feelings of veneration and love, bordering on enthusiasm. "I thought his death would have killed me," said the intelligent and aged lady before referred to, then a youthful bride; "but we could have been reconciled if he had left us some of those *great sermons* for publication."

Mr. Mecklin's power did not lie in the arts of elocution; for he stood before his people always with a small Bible open in his hand, whence he drew his inspiration and his learning. His theme was Christ crucified—Christ alone. "Christ all and in all," was expounded with so much unaf-

fected pathos, solemnity, and energy, that the large crowds which he attracted were often melted down by his loving tones. It is said to have been no unusual thing to see the *whole congregation* affected to tears by the divine unction of his words and manners. This fact is accredited by more than one witness.

During his ministry, the Huguenots, settled ten miles below, on Little River, flocked to his church. They had attended, in some measure, the services of Mr. Harris, but to many of them these ordinances must have been more nominal than real; for the older French adhered tenaciously to their native tongue, and very imperfectly, if at all, understood the English. They still maintained their lay worship and their Sabbath-schools at home; yet, taught, as they had been, that they were bound to assemble themselves together, even in woods and deserts, it is not a matter of wonder that they should seek to be fed with the crumbs of the blessed Gospel, though they were obliged, many of them, to walk eight or ten miles for this purpose.

For a considerable period all, and for a longer time many, of these desolate and sanctuary-loving people owed their spiritual teachings to the ministrations at Hopewell, thinking themselves happy that here they could meet to commemorate the love of their dying Lord. "It was affecting," said one of their number, "to see them meet at this place, always saluting each other with a kiss, while tears flowed down their cheeks." "They wept, yea, they wept when they remembered Zion."

The preaching of Mr. Mecklin was in character with their zeal and enthusiasm; but while engaged in pastoral visitation in the summer of 1788, he was stricken with fever, and died. He was originally from North Carolina, but his family had settled near Rocky River Church, where his remains lie. He had been but recently married, and left no descendants.

Mr. Mecklin was succeeded by Mr. Francis Cummings, from Bethel Presbytery, who had been a pupil of Dr. Hall, and was a preacher of high character and acceptability. There are some letters existing, written in regard to a difficulty between two of his elders, which exhibit wisdom and moderation.* In 1799, the Synod of the Carolinas met at Hopewell Church, and the opening sermon was preached by Mr. Cummings, from Luke, 13 : 22. During his pastorate the French membership reached its climax at Hopewell, and it was deemed important for them to have a representation in the Session. An election was held, which resulted in the choice of Joseph C. Calhoun, Andrew Weed, E. Pettigrew, Mr. Milligan, and Pierre Gibert, Esq. These men were ordained by Mr. Cummings before the close of the century. It had been now thirty years since the death of the French minister. A new generation had sprung up. The stern necessities created by the Revolution, which had principally operated in depriving them of a settled minister, had caused their gradual dispersion among their neighbors, and familiarity with their language; and by this means had effectually reconciled them to participating in the worship of a people whom they must have instinctively recognized as holding with them "one faith and one baptism."

The charge of Episcopacy has been made against these simple worshippers. This has arisen, in part, from the fact of the conforming of the parishes on the Santee, particularly St. Stephen's, to the Episcopal Church. The protesting of a few, however, seems to exculpate the Huguenot doctrine, and proves the adoption of the ritual to have been a matter of expediency, if not of necessity. Lawson gives a charming picture of the early fruits of their beautiful and simple faith, on the Santee, in 1700; and the colonists of

* Dr. Cummings was settled near Rocky River Church, and one of his descendants held the place of residence for some years after his exit. Francis Cummings removed to Greensboro', Georgia, and the honor of D.D. was probably conferred on him by Franklin College, at Athens.

New Bordeaux might have sat for a similar picture. "They are all of the same opinion," says he, "with the *Church of Geneva.*" We think the "Genevan Confession of Faith," or the "Heidelberg Catechism," afford ample means of settling this question. Witness, especially, the thirtieth article of the former; and the preface to the latter has a sentence which reads thus: "This is that which they call *confirmation*, which is nothing but a vain and ridiculous practice, destitute of foundation." This is said in reference to the superstitions which had crept into the Church in the middle ages.

It is very easy to see that the colony of Jean Louis Gibert was not in circumstances which would warrant their refusal of the condition imposed by King George, viz: a glebe and house of worship for the Church of England in their town; but if they had esteemed this a privilege, why did they not, on the death of their minister, which occurred in 1773,* while yet under the king's dominion, and in their highest state of prosperity, apply for a rector? There may have been some faint shadowings of the papal hierarchy in the modes of worship practised by the Bordeaux Church; tradition supplies us with one instance of the use of sponsors;† but it can not now be ascertained whether before or after the death of Mr. Gibert; so, also, there might have been

---

* The Rev. Mr. Gibert died suddenly, in the very prime of life, it is said, from eating a dish of mushroom—genus *Agaricus*—a delicacy highly esteemed by the French, but of which there was found a poisonous variety in the woods of Carolina.

† Madame ——, the widow of a Huguenot, fled from France to England with her two infant daughters. Whilst in the port, she was concealed under a barrel with her children; and to prevent their discovery by the policemen, she stopped the infants' mouths with handkerchiefs. After remaining some time in England, she came on with the colony to New Bordeaux. One of the daughters married M. David; and their children were baptized in the French town, M. Belott and wife standing as god-father and godmother. This incident we have from Jeannie Moragne, grand-daughter of M. David.

a Roman Catholic among them, for the wreck of their literature furnishes at least one Romish manual. This, however, is no decisive evidence. It is probable that when left to their own ecclesiastical government, some innovations may have crept in among a people who were from different provinces, and who had spent some years of exile in various foreign parts; but *reading prayers* in divine service need not be looked on in this light, for this was sanctioned by the Genevan Church, and Pierre Moragne, Sr., the most orthodox and most stubborn of the Huguenots, who refused even to speak a word of English, read prayers of his own composition, both in public and private worship. The religious fervor and affectionate enthusiasm of the French Protestants was a happy element blended with the more frigid systematizing spirit of the Scotch-Irish; yet they have never been considered pliant, but have been, to the present moment, the most obstinate opposers of new measures.

The Huguenots had not long enjoyed a representation in Hopewell, when an opening was made for the exercise of their religious privileges in a more convenient and advantageous position. In 1776 or '77, their attention was called to a missionary who travelled through the neighborhood on his way to a station, probably about Ninety-Six. This was the Rev. John Springer, formerly President of the college at old Cambridge, Abbeville District, but now resident in Georgia. Immediately on his road from Barksdale's ferry was a small log school-house near a fine spring, and within a mile of the site of New Bordeaux. Here he was induced to stop and preach occasionally till his death, which occurred in 1798. But the seed sown by the wayside was not left to perish; for the Rev. Moses Waddel, also a member of Hopewell Presbytery at that time, followed soon in the footsteps of the faithful missionary, and cheered the hearts of the Huguenots by the efforts of his youthful zeal. During the extraordinary revivals which characterized the

beginning of the present century, a camp-meeting was held at this place, by Messrs. Waddel, Cummings, Robert Wilson of Upper Long Cane, Hugh Dickson, then a licentiate, and perhaps others. This was in 1803, and, as far as we can learn, was no less interesting than those of the north-eastern districts. Mr. Waddel had at this time removed his academy from Columbia county, Georgia, to the high hill which overlooks Vienna, on the eastern bank of the Savannah, and was supplying the church at Hopewell, Dr. Cummings now having charge of Rocky River alone. The interest of the French people in this extraordinary young man was such that they were not satisfied with his itinerant labors, but they solicited and obtained a regular appointment for the third Saturday and Sunday in each month. A suitable frame building had been erected near the spring, on a piece of land appropriated to the Presbyterian church at this place. Many of those who had joined at Hopewell, transferred their membership to this place, and P. Gibert and P. Moragne, Jr., were chosen elders. Of his friendly intercourse with these people, Dr. Waddel spoke with pleasure to the very last of his life—the association seeming to open a vein of pleasant memories. In the charming families of "Squire" Gibert and others, he found society congenial to his taste; here he perfected his French, which he desired to speak with fluency; and no doubt the heart of this young disciple was profited by early contact with a people of such genuine and unostentatious piety—such mild, yet firm morality.

ARTICLE VII.

MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY. *In three volumes.*

Three great rivers, the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheld, had for ages deposited their slime amongst the dunes and the sand-banks heaved up by the ocean around their mouths. A delta was thus formed, habitable at last for man. It was a wild morass of oozy islands and savage forests, amongst lagoons and shallows, partly below the level of the ocean at its higher tides, and subject to constant overflow from rivers, and to frequent terrible inundations by the sea. The coast being skirted by an extensive belt of woodland, the close tangle of thickets operated to prevent the dunes cast up by the sea from drifting further inwards, and thus formed a natural breastwork against the ocean, which time and art were to strengthen. Well was such a country named Lowland, Netherland, Hollowland, or Holland. Here contended for ages, in stubborn conflict with the angry elements, a race thus to be educated for a great struggle with the still more savage despotism of man. Here they chained the ocean with their dykes, and forced mighty streams to fertilize their soil; and here they laid the foundation of a commerce with the furthest ends of the world, and of a great republic, destined to endure for more than two centuries.

When the Empire of Charlemagne fell to pieces, the Netherlands, early in the tenth century, pass out of France into Germany. Now there arise earldoms and dukedoms and other petty sovereignties of the Netherlands, which became hereditary. There are the Dukes of Brabant, the Earls of Flanders, and the Counts of Namur, Hainault,

Zutphen. There were also the Counts of Holland, dividing sway for centuries with their constant and powerful foes, the Bishops of Utrecht, over the seven little districts of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Overyssel, Groningen, Drenthe, and Friesland; all seven being portions of Friesland in the general sense, and destined afterwards to become the United States of the Netherlands, one of the most powerful republics of history.

By the tenth century the old Batavian, and later Roman forms of government, had faded away. There is no great popular assembly, as of old; no generals and temporary kings chosen by the people. The government is by the creatures of kings, till they abjure the creative power, and set up their own. The degenerate Carlovingians have not an arm strong enough to wield the sceptre over the wide realms of their empire. The people are alternately preyed upon by duke and by prelate, and esteem it a happiness to sell themselves into slavery, or to huddle together beneath the castle walls of some little potentate, for the sake of his wolfish protection. But during the five following centuries, three forces are operating upon each other, and upon the general movement of society: the force of the sword in the hands of bishop and of baron; the power of clerks, or the force of educated mind measuring itself against brute violence; and a third force, more potent than either of the preceding, the force of gold, the power of commerce embodied in cities leagued with cities. It is commerce which plucks up half-drowned Holland by the locks and pours gold into her lap; and gold brings strength, and then confidence and courage follow. Thus the mighty power of the purse developes itself, and municipal liberty becomes a substantial fact.

Thus, in these obscure provinces, as in all Europe, modern civilization builds itself up; and society, impelled by great and conflicting forces, makes progress. Agriculture and mechanical occupations begin to devolve upon freemen

instead of serfs. Little boroughs outside the castle gates of the land's master, began to be built up, and were encouraged by the nobles, to aggrandize themselves. Then the population, thus collected, began to divide into guilds, which afterwards grew to be bodies corporate, under charters from the sovereign. Tribunals were set up under these charters, where men of the burgher class were to sit in judgment. The Schout and Schepens, or chief magistrate and aldermen, in process of time came to be elected by the communities. Thus organized, and inspired with the breath of civic life, the communities of Flanders and Holland began to move rapidly forward, owing their advancing prosperity to commerce and to manufactures; and thus, too, the cities began to participate, not only in their own, but in the general government; and towns, as well as nobles, accordingly appear in the assembly of the provincial estates. Thus, also, in lands which nature had apparently condemned to obscure poverty, the principle of rational freedom or regulated liberty was taking deepest root. Already in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Friesland was a republic, all but the name; and Holland, Flanders, and Brabant, had acquired a large share of self-government.

About the close of the thirteenth century, the long line of the Counts of Holland dies out, and the title, with all its rights, passes to the Counts of Hainault. In another half century, the Hainault line expires. And now the country passes, by marriage, under the rule of the house of Burgundy. Philip, surnamed "the Good," seeks to curtail the political privileges of the Netherlands. A worse tyrant succeeds Philip—his son, Charles the Bold. The Netherlands were for him but as a bank, to be drawn upon for money. By two measures he prostrated the provinces: the removal of the supreme court from the Hague to Mechlin, and his maintenance of a standing army. The court, however, still held its sessions in the country, and the sacred privilege,

de non evocando, the right of every Hollander to be tried in his own land, (his *habeas corpus*,) was retained.

But in 1477, Charles lost his life; and his only child, the Lady Mary, succeeds. Within the provinces where Charles had played the tyrant, there is an elastic rebound, and all that was lost is recovered. The cities met in convention, and all feuds and parties are reconciled, in order to regain their rights. On the other hand, Louis the Eleventh seizes Burgundy; the Lady Mary appeals to the convention at Ghent for aid, and freely promises to confirm all their old immunities. Now is formally granted by her the "Groot Privilegie," or *Great Privilege*, the Magna Charta of Holland. It was a recapitulation and recognition of ancient rights, not an acquisition of new ones—a restoration, not a revolution. Its main points were:

1. The duchess should not marry without the consent of the estates of her provinces.

2. All offices should be filled with natives only.

3. The "Great Council of Holland" should be reëstablished.

4. The cities might hold diets as often as, and wherever, they chose.

5. No taxes should be imposed, and no war undertaken, without consent of the estates.

6. The Netherlands language to be employed in all public and all legal documents.

7. The commands of the duchess to be invalid, if in conflict with the rights of any city.

8. The sovereign to come in person before the estates to make requests for supplies.

Thus at one blow, the law, the sword, the purse, were taken from the sovereign's hand, and given back again into that of the Parliament.

Such, in brief, is Mr. Motley's graphic account of the rise and progress of Dutch freedom, down to the period of its formal acknowledgment in the celebrated instrument just

described. He has himself characterized it as "a recognition of ancient rights, not an acquisition of new privileges." Surely, then, it is not very consistent for him to represent it now as "a noble and temperate vindication of natural liberty." He proceeds to observe that "to no people, more than to the stout burghers of Flanders and Holland, belongs the honor of having battled audaciously and perennially in behalf of human rights."* Was it on behalf of *human* rights, or of *Netherland* rights, they contended? Did these stout burghers ever dream of acknowledging that all men had the very same? No more than Mr. Motley's forefathers or ours contended, in the revolution of 1776, for the rights of men, and not the rights peculiarly of Britons. To show the author's inconsistency with himself, in these and the many other similar expressions, which all along through this history drop from his pen, we may appeal to the reader of the foregoing sketch, every statement of which is borrowed from him, whether it is not a sketch of the history of constitutional, in distinction from natural freedom. We have said nothing not found in his pages, and we have said nothing respecting any rights except those of Flanders and Holland. But Mr. Motley is, in this particular, not only inconsistent with himself and his own statements, but he suffers himself to fall here into one of the most vulgar errors of our time. He contrasts "natural liberty, the doctrine of more enlightened days," with "natural servitude, the dogma of the dark ages." The enlightened days which the author talks about, are witnessing, in his own New England, and in the whole United States, the tame submission of freemen to a despotism which tramples their constitutional rights under foot; nay, the earnest coöperation of those freemen in every effort of that despotism to destroy constitutional liberty where alone it now exists upon this continent—in these Confederate States.

---

* Vol. I., p. 52.

Natural liberty is not the doctrine of any truly enlightened age, concerning man fallen and under the curse. It is, on the contrary, a doctrine of French infidelity. The turbid flow of such Jacobin ideas, alas! mingled early with the pure stream of the English doctrine of liberty, as it was asserted by our revolutionary forefathers. It mingles with and defiles the whole course of our author's observations upon the struggles of the Dutch for constitutional freedom. Mr. Motley partakes of the popular sentiments of his own people respecting human rights. His work has no doubt helped to confirm his countrymen in their creed on this subject. His charming story is the vehicle of conveying to the reader's mind, along with many just and noble political sentiments, much, also, that is false and corrupt. In opposition to these radical ideas, we assert that, as to the rights of man, whether considered in the light of the Christian Scriptures or of the soundest political wisdom, the truth is just this, that men have the same right to liberty that they have to property; that is, a right to so much of either, and no more, as they are born to, or as they may lawfully acquire. For there is no liberty worth the name, but rational and regulated liberty; and that is the creature of law, and a matter of inheritance. And thus Dutch rights and British rights have always been held to be very different from the rights of savages or of semi-barbarians, be they red or yellow, black or white.

To return from this digression. The Lady Mary espouses the Archduke Maximilian, and four years after bearing his son Philip, she falls from her horse and dies. This child is her recognized successor, and the Netherlands pass under the dominion of Austria. Thus the house of Hapsburg follows that of Burgundy, as it followed those of the Counts of Hainault and of Holland, and the puissant family of Brabant, in the rule over these provinces. Maximilian is regent now, and step by step he tramples out the liberties he had sworn to protect. He becomes Emperor in

1493, and the boy Philip, surnamed "the Fair," receives, at seventeen years of age, the homage of the different states of the Netherlands. He swears to maintain only what Philip the Good and Charles the Bold had granted; and relinquishing the Great Privilege, and all similar charters, the provinces accept him on these ignominious terms. In 1496, Philip the Fair marries Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. In the first year of the sixteenth century is born of her the second Charlemagne.

Charles the Fifth, King of Spain, Emperor of Germany, Autocrat of half the world, is now Lord of the Netherlands. His course of policy there, especially as carried out by his son, Philip the Second, after him, resulted in the revolt of those provinces. That revolt was both religious and political in its causes. Heresy was a plant of early growth in the Netherlands. From the most ancient period, neither prince, nor people, nor prelates, there, were very dutiful to the Pope. No where did those harbingers of the Reformation, the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Lollards, the Arnaldists, the Bohemian Brethren, endure a greater share of persecution, than in the Netherlands. Yet in the face of it, heresy flourished in that country. The Scriptures in Netherland rhyme were a potent engine in its hands. Meanwhile, the growing power and luxury of the clergy, and the Church's monstrous wealth, were provoking the hatred of many and mighty persons. Princes and barons, accustomed to the feudal right of military service from all who held lands of them, began, from the thirteenth century downwards, to dispute the title of ecclesiastics to hold vast estates without taxation, and without the performance of military duty. The Netherland sovereigns set themselves vigorously against clerical abuses of all sorts. In the fourteenth century, Wickliffe's doctrines make great progress in the land. In the next century, the invention of printing greatly advances the cause of the Reformation. At the same time, there is a great increase of ecclesiastical abuses in the

provinces. The people cry aloud there, as elsewhere, for reformation. Luther appears, and his doctrines are welcomed in the Netherlands. Charles the Fifth will suppress them by force. He introduces there the papal Inquisition. It is the bloody work of that inhuman court, and the bloody edicts of Charles, without even the pretence of sanction by the estates of Holland, which mainly distinguish the reign of Charles, so far as concerns the Netherlands. Tens of thousands of virtuous, well-disposed men and women, and not Anabaptists, were butchered in cold blood. For twenty years these dreadful edicts were the law of the land, condemning all heretics to death, but allowing repentant males to be slain with the sword, and repentant females to be buried alive, whilst the obstinate, of both sexes, were to be food for the flames.

This was the religious state of the Netherlands at the time of Charles' abdication in favor of Philip the Second, and these were the religious influences which operated in the great Netherland revolt. Let us now glance at the civil condition of the provinces at this period. Mr. Motley says, "the tendency was to substitute fictitious personages for men; a chain of corporations was wound about the liberty of the Netherlands." He says, "the people of the United Netherlands was the personage yet to be invented." "Instead of popular rights, there were state rights; for the large cities, with extensive districts and villages under their government, were rather petty states than municipalities." In his view, it was a great defect that these institutions of the provinces were in so moderate a degree democratic in their character. "There was popular power enough to effect much good, but it was widely scattered, and, at the same time, confined in artificial forms." The supreme legislative and executive functions belonged to the sovereign, yet each city made its by-laws, and possessed, besides, a body of statutes and regulations, made from time to time by its own authority, and confirmed by the prince.

The chief city of the Netherlands, and the commercial capital of the world, Antwerp, for example, had the sovereign solemnly sworn to govern according to the ancient charters and laws. The stadtholder, as his representative, shared his authority with the four estates of the city. There was a Senate of eighteen, appointed by the stadtholder out of a quadruple number nominated by the Senate itself and by the fourth body, called the Borgery. The deans of the guilds, fifty-four in number, two from each guild, selected by the Senate from a triple list of candidates presented by the guilds, composed this fourth body. Their duty was to conduct the examination of candidates claiming admittance to any guild, and to superintend the general affairs of the guilds. Then there was the board of ancients, or ex-senators; and the board of ward-masters, appointed, two from each ward, by the Senate, on nomination by the wards, whose special business it was to enrol the militia, and to attend to its mustering and training. These four branches, with their functionaries and dependents, composed the commonwealth of Antwerp. Assembled together in council, they constituted the great and general court. And no tax could be imposed by the sovereign except with consent of the four branches, all voting separately.

Now our author, of course, believes in the government of the people, directly exercised. We, on the contrary, believe in representative government, both in church and in state; that is, government by the people, but not exercised directly and immediately; government in the hands of chosen rulers. We are as great enemies as Mr. Motley can be to "arbitrary rule," where it robs a people of an inheritance of liberty which has been handed down to them from their fathers, and for which, accordingly, they are prepared by having been educated in its use and enjoyment. But we have no sympathy with his ideas of "human rights." Nor can we sympathize with his appreciation of "popular rights," in distinction from "state rights." Both are

sacred, precisely in proportion as they are just and well-founded. Indeed, what a grand and sacred struggle for state rights that is, which Mr. Motley's own people are just now ruthlessly forcing upon this free-born Confederacy. He rightly observes, that "it was the principle of mercantile association, in the middle ages, which protected the infant steps of human freedom and human industry against violence and wrong." Alas! freedom, let us tell the author, is no more an attribute of humanity, in its present fallen state, than is industry. Those "loftier ideas of human rights," which he so frequently alludes to, in a very indefinite way, are nothing but lower ideas of what liberty is, and what is necessary to be developed in any people, before they can possess or enjoy it. "State rights" go for little with Mr. Motley, as with his countrymen; yet he well remarks that "the spirit of local self-government was always the life-blood of liberty." They are its life-blood now, on this continent, where not the centrifugal force has been too much developed, as he says it was in the Netherlands, but the centripetal, and where the liberties of the Southern States, we trust, are being saved from that central Maelstrom which has swallowed up all those of our former associates of the North.

What we have been pointing out, is one of the defects of this author. His work is tinctured with radicalism. He sneers, for example, at Philip of Burgundy's sovereignty "*by inheritance*" over some of the provinces, and he equalizes it with his sovereignty over others of them "*by force or fraud.*" * Now, we submit that these reproaches cast upon *inherited rights*, ill become any philosophic historian. Even for New England this is a dangerous doctrine, where there is such vast inequality of wealth. As for ourselves, we believe what the Saviour of mankind taught upon this subject. Some men are born to rule, and others to be ruled

* Vol. I., p. 134.

by them. Cæsar has *his things*, which must be rendered to him. We believe that absolute government is ordained of God, as well as republics; it follows that the rights of different nations are different, and their duties different. The charm of Mr. Motley's story of the Netherland struggle against tyranny is, that it is the tale of a people's maintaining what of liberty and self-government was theirs by right of birth, and also of the same people's legitimately acquiring in the conflict other and larger franchises. It is the same conflict which, in the seventeenth century, kings and parliament carried on in England, when the liberties of England grew apace. The same general principles were at work, and the same results were attained. It is the same conflict now waging on this continent, between the sovereign States of this Confederacy and the tyrant at Washington, who seeks to despoil them of inherited and chartered rights. It is natural, of course, that Mr. Motley, with his radical ideas, should view the position of affairs in the Netherlands differently from ourselves. He is for universal liberty and human rights. We have been taught in no such school of infidelity. The question of a creature's rights is, with us, a question of God's providence. Government is a divine ordinance, and rights a divine allotment. The rights of Dutchmen, Britons, Americans, are not the rights of all men. If Mr. Motley's radical ideas make him confound things that are not the same, and can not be made the same, it is his misfortune, and a blot upon his beautiful production. He ought to know that all true liberty for nations must be the growth of ages, a thing of gradual and very slow acquirement, a developement from within a people, and not a gift conferred, *ab extra*, upon them.

The author has been charged with perverting and falsifying history. A writer amongst ourselves has published that Motley gives an "*angelic*" portrait of William of Orange, but a "*fiend-like*" picture of Philip the Second. It is not to be denied, that both these characters are strongly drawn,

and William has certainly been charged with some faults by others, which we do not observe that Motley refers to at all. But as to Philip's character, let it be remembered that he does not stand solitary in his infamy, as described by our author. Catharine de Medici, he writes down as "the Italian she-wolf with a litter of cowardly and sanguinary princes." And, indeed, was not Henry the Second fit to be reckoned the progenitor of a race of wolf's cubs, when he leagued himself with Philip the Second to extirpate Protestantism by a murderous extirpation of his own Protestant subjects themselves? Or, will it be questioned that the Duke of Alva was the savage wretch he is here described as being? If Philip's picture is "fiend-like," what shall be said of Alva's, or of Granvelle's, or of that of Charles the Ninth, the author of the stupendous massacre of St. Bartholomew? It seems to us that Motley says well, "The time is past when it could be said that the cruelty of Alva, or the enormities of his administration, have been exaggerated by party violence." "No historical decision is final; an appeal to a more remote posterity, upon more accurate evidence, is always valid." But when "the Duke's own letters can be read; when the testimony to the Duke's crimes are from the criminal's own lips," it is certainly "vain to be expressing historic doubts" of the justice of the charges against him.* And so it must seem that when, "by the resuscitation of secret documents, over which the dust of three centuries has gathered, we are enabled to study the working of a system of perfect tyranny," when we find amongst these dusty records "a careful portrait of a consummate tyrant, painted by his own hand, in a living daily correspondence with his most trusted confidants;" surely, then we need not question the truthfulness of the picture, merely because it is "fiend-like." Have we never before heard of fiend-like dispositions in human nature?

* Vol. II., p. 505.

In the very war that is now being waged by Mr. Motley's countrymen against ourselves, has there been no display of diabolic deceitfulness or fiendish malignity? Witness the constant misrepresentations of the mendacious Northern press, and even of the chief generals of their army, stimulating their government and their army by false telegrams about victories gained, where, in fact, they met defeats. Witness the brutal attempt to starve the people of Norfolk into the profession of a loyalty they did not feel! Witness the atrocious inhumanity of some of their appliances of war, as, for example, of the bomb-bullet, made of two parts, with explosive materials within one of them, the whole arranged so that upon entering the flesh of our soldiers, and meeting with a bone, the bullet must burst and inflict the most ghastly and fatal wound.* Witness, above all, that infamous order of their general, Benjamin F. Butler, encouraging his soldiers to treat any lady of New Orleans, who should "by word or gesture" manifest her natural and just contempt and hatred for our invaders, "as a woman of the town plying her vocation"!

Let it also be borne in mind, when we stand aghast at the mendaciousness of Spanish, and even French politics, as portrayed by Motley, that Machiavelli was the common teacher of all European statesmen of that day. But, not to dwell upon this point, there can be no doubt that our author has had access to the best sources of knowledge.

---

* This statement is made on the published authority of M. F. MAURY, under his own name. This distinguished officer writes as follows:

"To shoot with poisoned arrows is universally admitted to be both savage and barbarous, but our men have been shot with explosive bullets. Imagine a Minie bullet to be cut in two, transversely, and a wire to be inserted endwise through the front half, or cone; the other part is then hollowed out into a cup, filled with fulminate or some other explosive substance, and then securely fitted upon the front part, and in such a manner that when the ball strikes, the wire is driven back, and so by concussion explodes the ball inside the wounded man. Is not that, think you, equal to the poisoned arrow? There can be no mistake about it, for I have seen the missile itself, and would send you one if I could find a safe conveyance for the dangerous thing. The true aim of the savage warfare is to kill and murder; of civilized, to wound and disable. Which is it that the Yankees are waging?"

He has studied this history as well in Dutch as in Spanish writers that have not been generally accessible. Moreover, it is well known that recently the governments of Europe have opened their archives to the inspection of scholars; and thus Mr. Motley has possessed himself of information upon many points not hitherto understood. His integrity ought not to be questioned without good reason. From Brandt he has copied much into his text, and we have found on comparison that he is accurate and careful. The various other Dutch and Spanish authorities followed by him, we have had no opportunity to examine; but he gives chapter and page, wherever he makes statements upon their authority, and so he could hardly venture, even if we supposed him a dishonest writer, to quote them unfairly.

Mr. Motley is a great portrait painter. His work abounds with admirable pictures of men and scenes. We are not now expressing any opinion of the justness of the portraits, but only of their skilful execution as works of art. Charles the Fifth, Philip the Second, William of Orange, the Duke of Alva, the Cardinal Granvelle, Lamoral, Count of Egmont, St. Aldegonde, Don John of Austria, Louis of Nassau, Juan de Vargas, Alexander of Parma, President Viglius, and Balthazar Gerard, the assassin of the Prince, are all life-like, exquisite pictures, now provoking the reader's admiration, and again exciting his detestation of the subject portrayed for his inspection. So, the humiliation of Ghent, the abdication of Charles, the iconomachy in the Netherlands, the origin and rise of the party of the Gueux, the siege of Alkmaar, the sack of Zutphen, the razing of Naarden, the heroic but unavailing defence of Harlem, the massacre at Antwerp, the rescue of Leyden; these are all masterpieces of historical description. The author has vast command of language, and a fine imagination. In the titles affixed to his various chapters, he is frequently a little finical, but we do not observe any such offences against good taste in the body of the work. He

is always attractive, and frequently very eloquent. In short, what he says of the manuscript history of Pontus Payen, so often referred to by him for authority, may be justly said of his own production: his striking sketches, characteristic anecdotes, minute traits, shew the keen observer of men and things: he possesses the dramatic power of setting men and things before the eyes of his readers: his work is full of color and invaluable detail.

We propose to present to the readers of this journal, who can not now obtain the work itself, a sketch of the main facts of the story, and then to offer some observations upon them.

Seven years before his accession, Philip the Second had sworn allegiance to all the charters, constitutions, and privileges of the Netherlands cities. Neither his father nor his grand-father had taken so large an oath. The object was to conciliate the people. Feeble in body, Philip was incredibly small in mind. He had a petty passion for contemptible details, and was slow of speech, but especially prolix with the pen. To one great purpose, early formed, he adhered inflexibly; and that was, the extirpation of Protestant heresy, and the vindication of his title of the most Catholic king. He was intensely Spanish, and it was his policy to rule the Netherlands by Spaniards. Herein his feelings were not like his father's, and herein he forgot one of the wisest lessons Charles had given to his son.

The truce of Vaucelles, signed the 5th of February, 1556, was, through the arts of Pope Paul the Fourth and his nephew, Cardinal Caraffa, very soon interrupted by war between France, in league with the Pope, and Spain. It was an unnatural war, considered in its religious aspects. Philip did so consider it. He was troubled in conscience at the hostile position in which it placed him, as respected the head of the Church of Rome. Nor did Henry the Second himself desire the war. An interview occurs at Peronne, between two ecclesiastics, which involved the future fate of

millions. The Bishop of Arras, afterwards Cardinal Granvelle, and the Cardinal de Lorraine, brother of the Duke of Guise, together resolved upon an end of the present war, so that the two monarchs might unite heart and hand for the extirpation of heresy. Philip determines to begin his crusade against it in the Netherlands, and, with a view to this, arranges to remove his residence to Spain. He appoints Margaret of Parma, the natural daughter of Charles the Fifth, to be Regent; three boards of council are to assist her in the government; the real power, however, was in the *Consulta*, a committee of three members of the state council, by whose deliberations she was instructed secretly to be guided on all important occasions. These three, however, Viglius, Berlaymont, and Arras, were but one, and that one was Arras.

There remained after the peace about four thousand foreign soldiers in the provinces; they were a licentious and rapacious crew, and were felt by the people to be an intolerable burthen. On the 7th of August, 1559, all the provinces were assembled, by their representatives, at Ghent, to receive the parting words of the King. They were spoken through Arras, and full and free mention was made of the "new, reprobate, and damnable sects," and the Regent was publicly enjoined to enforce the edicts for their extirpation; at the same time, the King demands a new levy, of considerable amount. The provinces return their answer, agreeing, all of them, to pay their respective contingents, but all stipulating, as an express antecedent condition, the removal of the Spanish soldiery. The King is grievously offended, but promises what he intended never to perform. Especially was he offended with Orange, at whose door, when departing for Spain, he publicly and with insults laid the thwarting of his plans.

Arras was not only a selfish flatterer, and a ready tool of the Spanish monarch, but he was also his adroit manager, and the guide of his conduct. Being a strict absolutist, he

readily opposed himself to the natural rights of the Netherlands. It was by his advice, too, that the remorseless edict of 1550, an ordinance of blood and fire, was reënacted, as the very first measure of Philip's reign. It provided that no one should sell or buy, give or possess, any writing of Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, or other heretics; no lay person should converse or dispute concerning the Scriptures, or read, teach, or expound them, unless theologically educated; no conventicles should be held; no one should give food or lodging to any suspected of heresy. What was the penalty? Men transgressing, if they did not persist, were to be slain with the sword; and women, in the same case, were to be buried alive; but if they persisted, of whichsoever sex, they were to be burned alive! Such was Philip's first gift to the Netherlands; and now, upon his departure, this bloody edict was to be executed with the utmost rigor. To add to the apprehensions of the people, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, the number of bishops and the force of the inquisition were to be increased. Instead of the existing four sees, there were to be three archbishoprics, to be filled by the King and the Pope, with fifteen subordinate bishoprics; moreover, each of these fifteen bishops was to appoint nine additional prebendaries, to assist him in the matter of the inquisition throughout his bishopric, two of whom were themselves to be inquisitors.

It was in 1560, the same year that John Knox and his brethren in Scotland organized the Presbyterian Church of that country, that these causes of agitation and dismay in the Netherlands began to operate. To their ancient constitutions, called *handvests*, because the sovereign made them fast with his hand, the people appealed against the dreaded threatenings of Philip's arbitrary power; of Philip's tyranny, who, of all their monarchs, had made especially fast those same constitutions. There was the constitution of Brabant, which provided that the prince should "not increase the clerical powers without the consent of the

nobility and the cities; that he should prosecute no one of his subjects, except in the ordinary and open courts, where the accused might answer, with the help of advocates; that he should appoint no foreigners to office in Brabant; and that, should the prince violate any of these privileges, the inhabitants of Brabant should be thereby discharged of their oaths of allegiance, and might thenceforward conduct themselves as free, independent, and unbound people." Similar were the constitutions and charters of the other provinces, and they were all duly signed and sealed. It was this kind of freedom to which the Netherlands had been long accustomed—the freedom of chartered rights; and of this the hand of a ruthless tyrant was now about to rob them. The clerical state was to be enlarged, against the will of nobles and of cities both, and the administration of justice was to be in the hands of bishops and their creatures, many of them foreigners, and most of them monks. It was not the rights of man, as the author so frequently allows himself to state, but the peculiar and inherited rights of Brabant and of Holland, that were assailed, and in defence of which a long and bloody contest was impending.

Foremost in resistance to aggressions upon these rights, was the Prince of Orange. He was the heir of vast estates and exalted ancestral honors. He was now the stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht. At a very early age he became a page in the Emperor's household; and, with his customary quickness, the Emperor had recognized the remarkable character of the boy. At fifteen, he was the intimate, almost confidential friend of the Emperor, at whose interviews with the highest personages and on the gravest affairs, Charles would never suffer him to be considered superfluous or intrusive. Thus, carefully to observe men's actions, and silently to ponder their motives, was the favorite occupation of the Prince during his apprenticeship at court; and as he advanced to man's estate, he was con-

stantly selected by the Emperor for the highest duties. It was while sojourning at the French court, as one of the four hostages for the fulfilment of the Spanish treaty, and when hunting with King Henry in the forest of Vincennes, separated from the rest of the company, that the monarch, by a strange fatuity, confided to him the secret scheme agreed on between Philip and himself for the extirpation of "that accursed vermin," the Protestants. His fellow-hostage, the Duke of Alva, was to be the appointed agent in this dreadful business; and Henry appears to have supposed that William was also party to the plot. The way in which the Spanish regiments, detained in the Netherlands, were to further the scheme, and the whole details of it, were laid open by Henry in the most unsuspecting manner. Horror-struck and indignant, the Prince yet held his peace, and kept his countenance; and thus, he who was so rich in conversational endowments, earned his celebrated surname of "the Silent." His purpose, however, was fixed from that hour. To the further stay of the foreign troops, and to the increase of the bishops, he began to oppose the most earnest efforts with the Regent, with Arras, and with the King himself. Egmont and other influential nobles second his efforts, and upon one point they are successful—the troops are removed.

It was soon after this there began the long and mortal combat of Arras, now Cardinal Granvelle, with Orange and the two counts, Egmont and Horn. He was setting himself to monopolize all the powers of the government, and at the same time filling Philip's mind with suspicions and resentment against these nobles. They were represented as wishing to reduce the King's power to a cipher, and to set up a republic or oligarchy under themselves; they were all bankrupts, and this was their plan to enrich themselves. Their opposition to the increase of the bishops, and to the further developement of the inquisition, was to throw dust into the people's eyes, and to render his Majesty odious.

The nobles write to the King, on the 11th of March, 1563, a letter of complaints against the Cardinal, and of warnings to himself. His answer, from Spain, was dictated by Granvelle, in the Netherlands. It acknowledged their zeal, but proposed, as they have made no specific charges, that one of them should in person visit Spain, for the purpose of conference. But they all declined the journey. Meanwhile, the Duchess of Parma herself grows weary of the arbitrary sway of Granvelle, and sends her secretary with no friendly reports of him to the King. The nobles formally withdraw from all share in the management of affairs. Philip takes counsel of Alva, and Alva recommends the use of force without stint, to crush the rising spirit of the Dutch. Meanwhile, the Cardinal continues to chronicle for Philip's eye all the sayings and doings of the chief men of the Netherlands. He deplores the progress of heresy, and the slackness of the inquisitors; and he entreats the King, for the love of God, to put his royal hand to the blessed work. He reports to Philip the gathering of German troops on the borders of the Netherlands, as in the employment of the disaffected rebels; and into the most suspicious ear that ever listened to a tale of treason, he poured his own conviction that a republic by the aid of these foreign troops was being planned. Thus, little by little, he spread before his sovereign's eye a canvass, on which certain prominent figures, highly colored by patiently accumulated touches, were represented as driving a whole nation, against its own will, into manifest revolt. The situation was just one of factitious popular discontent, procured by a few impoverished Catilines; not a rising rebellion, such as the world had never seen, born of the slowly-awakened wrath of a whole people, after a martyrdom of many years.

But Philip, urged by Margaret, decides to remove Granvelle. A feeling of relief is experienced in the provinces upon his departure. Orange and the other two nobles return to the council. The Prince keeps steadily in view, in all

his labors for reform, three great objects: first, the convocation of the states-general; secondly, the abolition or moderation of the edicts against heresy; and, thirdly, the suppression of the privy council and the council of finance. These were both sinks of iniquity. There was general corruption amongst the officials of the government, and the highest dignitaries were really the most mercenary hucksters. The Duchess herself, and her secretary, Armenteros, (nicknamed Argenteros, from his cupidity,) were both rolling up fortunes for themselves; and the latter, though a mere clerk, was acquiring a complete ascendency over the Regent. Against this monster of corruption, Orange found as great a battle before him as that he had been waging against the selfish ambition and intolerable arrogance of the Cardinal. Impoverished himself, yet never did he plunge his hands into the public treasury; his honor was never tarnished by any such suspicions.

Meanwhile, the prisons were thronged with victims of the inquisition, and the streets were filled with processions to the stake. The population of Flanders, especially, is maddened with barbarities, exercised not only upon criminals, but upon men of blameless life. Peter Titelmann, the sub-inquisitor, is violating all decency as well as justice in his horrible cruelties. The four estates of Flanders complain of him in vain to the King. The Duchess herself is evidently in mortal fear of him. But there is no yielding by Philip. On the contrary, he issues new decrees against heresy. The inns are to receive no travellers, the schools no children, the alms-houses no paupers, the very graves no dead, unless orthodox in the faith. Marriages, births, and deaths, all alike are to be under the baleful shadow of the Church.

The Regent is in great difficulty respecting the publication of these edicts. Egmont is to be sent on a special mission to Spain, and the council are preparing his instructions. When it is Orange's turn to vote, the Silent opens

his lips, and pours forth vehement discourse. The time had come when the King must be told the whole truth. The whole machinery of scaffolds, inquisitors, etc., must be abolished. The Netherlands were free, and to be free. The frightful corruptions must, also, be exposed to Philip. The two lesser councils must be abolished. Above all, the canons of Trent were not to be enforced. A Catholic himself, he intended to continue such, but he could not look on with pleasure and see princes undertake to govern the souls of men, or take away their liberty of conscience and of religion.

Egmont goes to Spain, but accomplishes nothing. Philip overpowers him with blandishments and gifts. Returning, he brings back nothing satisfactory. Orange reproaches him to his face. But an assembly of bishops and doctors is called by the Duchess, in accordance with Philip's instructions; and they concluded, unanimously, that the edicts had been working well for thirty-five years, and that there should be no change in the treatment of offenders. It is thus settled that there shall be no compromise with heresy. There is great agitation amongst the people—it were better to die arms in hand, than be butchered by the inquisition. The Regent beseeches Philip to revise his instructions for the inquisitors. His reply is decisive, and produces the extremest consternation. Inflammatory hand-bills amongst the people call on the three nobles to come forth as champions of popular liberty. Orange, in the council, declares there is no middle path between obedience and rebellion, and he washes his hands, as a councillor of state, of the whole proceedings of the government. Nevertheless, a proclamation is prepared, ordering that the canons of Trent, the edicts, and the inquisition, should be published in every town and village immediately, and also once every six months for ever afterwards. The deed is done. Orange stoops to the ear of his next neighbor, and whispers: "Now begins the most extraordinary tragedy ever enacted."

This decree is answered with a howl of execration by the people. The four chief cities of Brabant formally denounce the outrage in an elaborate document, addressed to the Regent, setting forth that the recent proclamation violated many articles in their city charter.

In the early part of 1566, is formed what was called the Compromise, a league chiefly of the lesser nobles at first, but afterwards of many burghers and citizens, bound together by solemn oaths, for mutual protection against the edicts of the inquisition. Orange stood aloof from it, having no confidence in the chief movers. A new step is shortly taken by the confederates, which was to make "a Request" of the Regent. Orange gathers the chief members of the league and of the nobility together, to confer about it, and to moderate it. He desired a convocation of the states-general—but there was no agreement effected. On the 3d of April, 1566, the long-expected cavalcade of leaguers enters Brussels, two hundred in number, with Brederode at their head. Next day, one hundred more appear. On the 5th of April, they present their "Request" to the agitated Duchess. It asked for the abolition of the edicts of the inquisition. A meeting of the council is assembled. Orange seeks to calm the fears of the Regent. Berlaymont, another of the council, speaks of them as "beggars," (*gueux*,) and urges Margaret to make short work with them. No good came of the "Request," nor of the Compromise itself. The Regent put them off. They meet at Culemburg, to partake of a dinner provided by their leader, where wine and dainties were plentiful. They want a name. Brederode proposes "the beggars." It is accepted vociferously, and they all drink to the toast, "*Vivent les gueux!*" Thus originates a war-cry destined to ring over sea and land, amid blazing cities, and on blood-stained decks, and through the smoke and carnage of many a stricken field. The beggars next select a garb which the young gentlemen should wear, discarding gold lace and

velvet. It was a doublet and hose of ashen grey, with short cloaks of the same color, all of the coarsest materials. They wore, also, felt hats, and carried beggars' bowls and sacks at their side. They also, like mendicants, shaved close their beards, saving their long and pendant moustaches. Minutely and carefully were all these things reported at Madrid. Meanwhile, the rumor goes forth of a moderation of the edicts, through the influence of the Request. But when the project did appear, in fifty-three articles, drawn up by Viglius, what was it? Only a substitution of the halter for the fagot! The common people called it the *murderation.* It passes the estates of Artois, Hainault, and Flanders; and Baron Montigny and the Marquis Berghen are persuaded, very reluctantly, to carry it to Madrid, for the royal sanction. They did not know the full danger of the mission. They did not suspect how continuously Granvelle had been reporting them as renegades and rebels. Both of them fell victims to the Cardinal's treacherous wiles and the cruel craft of Philip, and neither of them ever returned out of Spain. Their mission was but an elaborate farce, to introduce a terrible tragedy. Sent to procure the abolition of the inquisition, and the moderation of the edicts, Margaret of Parma possessed at the very time secret letters evincing the King's fixed purpose to maintain both in their rigor.

While riotous nobles were profaning the sacred cause of the Netherlands, which they assumed to protect, and while a tyrant king was projecting such measures of savage bigotry for his people, these were conducting themselves in a way to put both to shame. For now was beginning to be manifested the first great popular phase of the great rebellion. The people's thirst for the exercise of the Reformed religion was mustering them in thousands, in the open fields, to sing hymns and hear sermons. They were, perhaps, emboldened by a lull of the persecution, and by the apparent success of the Request. Their preachers were,

some of them, hatters, tanners, etc., and some learned and profound scholars, as Francis Junius, Wille, De Bray, and Marnier. The assembly was sometimes of six, sometimes of ten, sometimes of twenty, and sometimes even of thirty and forty thousand persons. These preachings spread throughout the Walloon provinces to the northern Netherlands. The worshippers were mostly of the Calvinistic faith, but some were Lutherans, and some Anabaptists. The Duchess orders the magistrates of Antwerp to put down the meetings. Tumults threaten. The Prince of Orange is called on to quiet them; and his temperate firmness is successful so long as he is able to remain there. But his own government of Holland and Zeeland demands his care. Armed assemblages, utterly beyond the power of the civil authorities, were taking place at Amsterdam. Yet he could not be spared from Antwerp for a day. Meanwhile, a fresh complication with the confederate nobles was at hand, and the Prince must meet, by Margaret's orders, a committee at Duffel. The body represented was a wild, tumultuous convention of fifteen hundred cavaliers, with other armed attendants. There was a constant din of revelry and uproar, in which the cry of "*Vivent les gueux*" was incessant. It was an ill-timed and violent demonstration, without beneficial results. But the dissolution of this convention is followed immediately by a sudden and terrific explosion of popular feeling, productive of the most serious consequences. The 18th of August was approaching, when the ceremony of the Ommegang was to occur, the principal object of which was to conduct around the city of Antwerp a colossal image of the Virgin issuing from the door of the cathedral. A meeting of the knights of the order of the Golden Fleece was to be held, and the Regent desired Orange's presence at Brussels. He knew the danger of his leaving Antwerp, and warned her of it—but his presence seemed indispensable at the capital. He left; and there took place the Netherlands' iconomachy, when all the grand architec-

tural monuments of Gothic art in the Low Countries were trampled under foot. It began, on the above-mentioned day, at Antwerp, and it was all finished in the course of six or seven days. It was a sudden explosion of the popular revenge against the symbols of that Church which had so long persecuted them and their brethren. It was a violent expression of sympathy for doctrines that had taken possession of the popular heart. It was a depravation of that instinct which had led the thousands to hear the truth of the Gospel proclaimed. The Reformed ministers all denounced the iconomachy. No personal outrages, and no pillage, accompanied the movement. Yet the effects of it were disastrous to the Reformation party—it was an abandonment of the high ground occupied by the people, when, quietly and peacefully, being shut out from the public exercise of their worship in the cities, they had gone forth, a sublime spectacle, in thousands, to the preaching of the Gospel in the fields.

The immediate result of it was, the greatest terror on the part of the Regent, and her "Accord" of freedom to the Reformed worship wherever it had been already set up.

The course of the government at Madrid, whilst these events were occurring in the Netherlands, had been simply to procrastinate and to dissemble. Very plainly and honestly did Berghen and Montigny portray to the King the popular discontent, and the danger of actual revolt. Three points, they urged, must be conceded: the abolition of the inquisition, moderation of the edicts, and ample pardon for all past transactions. Daily consultations are held about these demands of the envoys, at the grove of Segovia. Philip said little, but he took notes plentifully. There had been, to his mind, three previous, and now here was a fourth link in the chain of treason. There was: *first*, the cabal against Granvelle; *secondly*, Egmont's mission to obtain a moderation of the state council, with the design of bringing it under the control of the great nobles; *thirdly*, the

insolent and seditious Request; and now, *fourthly*, this proposition of the envoys.

Philip's answer is at length given. *First*, the papal inquisition might cease for a time, as the episcopal was quite vigorous; *secondly*, the moderation proposed was inadmissible, and a new project might be submitted; *thirdly*, the pardon might be granted, but it must be so restricted as to exclude all who deserved to be chastised. This gracious answer, however, had been delayed for months, and meanwhile the field-preachings and the image-breaking had taken place.

But, immediately after this answer to the envoys had been given, the King sends for a notary, and before witnesses declares the pardon not free, and so not binding on him. He writes, also, to the Pope, that the suspension of the papal inquisition was, of course, not binding on him without the sanction of his Holiness; and that as to any moderation of the edicts, it should never be by him accepted. The whole he desired might be kept a profound secret.

When the answer of the King reached Brussels, the administration there made great efforts to represent it as what ought to be entirely satisfactory to all. The people, however, suspected the truth, and Orange was convinced of it. Viglius urges the promised visit of the King in person, and if that might not be, then the assembly of the states. Philip writes to the Regent that this assembly never should take place, but to "keep this a profound secret."

Now arrives at Madrid the news of the field-preaching, and the iconomachy, and the Accord of the Duchess. The Regent sends, also, her confession of her fault in granting it, and her excuse for the same, together with her accusations against Orange, Egmont, and Horn, as having compelled her to this course. At the same time, she reminded Philip that her promise did not bind him, and expressed the hope that he would pay no regard to it.

Philip is enraged, but dissembles. He speaks softly and gently, but he prepares to send to the rebellious Netherlands the terrible Duke of Alva.

The popular mind turns to Egmont for a leader, and he might have had the whole country at his back. But the image-breaking had disgusted him, a zealous Roman Catholic. He repairs to his government of Flanders, and there he acts the unscrupulous partisan of government against the people, in the execution of numerous offenders.

William of Orange himself executes, at Antwerp, three of the rioters; but the preaching having occurred within the city before the Accord, he arranges an agreement with the Reformed upon that basis. He allows three churches to the different sects, and stipulates for mutual toleration between Protestants and Catholics. Such a religious peace (destined to be very short lived) he also established at Amsterdam, Utrecht, and other cities of his government. By this course, he gave great offence to those who were above him, but has thereby gained immortal renown. To him belongs the imperishable honor of having practised religious toleration in an age of universal dogmatism.

At Tournay, where three-fourths of the people were of the Reformed, Horn also allowed three places outside the walls, where churches might be built for the Reformed, and the Duchess formally consented to the permission. But as the winter came on, the people urged that they should be suffered to have meeting places within the walls, and Horn agreed to it. Great offence was thus given to the Duchess, and in the King's eyes it was a fatal crime. The fierce Noircarmes is sent to Tournay, and the city forcibly subjugated, and the Reformed religion suppressed. Meanwhile, Margaret is constantly writing to Philip against the great nobles. She charges them with the design of dividing the country out amongst themselves, and having arranged a general massacre of the Roman Catholics, to commence as

soon as the King should put foot on shipboard to come to the Netherlands.

The Prince of Orange, thoroughly understanding the *situation*, and perceiving that his country was to be subjugated, and his own life sacrificed, begins now, in 1566, to think and speak "treasonably." To Egmont and to Horn he writes, accordingly, warning them both of the common danger, and proposing that they should league together against Philip, in order to remain loyal to their duty and their country. Now occurs, also, the famous Dendermonde Conference, between Orange, Egmont, Horn, Louis of Nassau, and Hoogstraten. Henceforward, however, the paths of the three chief nobles diverge. After long vacillation, Egmont had decided for loyalty to Philip; and Horn, in wrath and moodiness, had retired to his "desert." Thus the two men upon whom William had relied the most, had separated from him. The confederacy of nobles had been dissolved, without accomplishing any thing for the country. They well-nigh ruined it by their folly and incapacity. Its sacred and holy cause they had profaned by indecent orgies, compromised by seditious demonstrations, and then abandoned, when it was most in need of assistance. For many individuals of them, no doubt, it was reserved to render honorable service in the national cause. The names of Louis of Nassau, Marnix of St. Aldegonde, and Bernarde de Merode, were to be written in letters of gold upon the country's rolls; but at this moment they were impatient, inconsiderate, and out of the control of Orange. What was he to do? Valenciennes had been summoned to receive a garrison at the same time with the unhappy Tournay, and had met the demand with a peremptory refusal. Her resistance could hardly have been prevented, even by the opposition of the Prince. But why should he take the field against men or cities who, however rashly and ineffectually, were endeavoring to oppose tyranny? Had his warnings been heeded, there might have been some head

made against the common enemy. But, alas! so it was not. Till late in the autumn of 1566, he had believed in the possibility of getting convoked the states-general. Even the Regent, as well as the Roman Catholics generally, had favored the measure. But when Tournay, and also Valenciennes, had fallen, she was less alarmed, and the people began to lose courage. The Prince, therefore, remains comparatively quiescent, but watchful.

It is not long before the Duchess calls on William, and all the stadtholders and other functionaries, to take a new oath of allegiance. He indignantly refuses, and resigns all the offices he filled. In Brederode's expedition to relieve Valenciennes he took no part, as he lacked confidence in the man and his measures. But in the tremendous tumults for three days at Antwerp, which followed the destruction of Brederode's forces under young Thoulouse, the Prince showed his characteristic courage and determination, and it was his wisdom and bravery which suppressed the tumult.

Valenciennes falls at the hands of Noircarmes and Egmont. The utmost cruelty is practised upon its inhabitants. Many hundreds of victims are sacrificed by strangling and the sword. The franchises of the city are all revoked. "For two whole years," (says a Roman Catholic historian,) "there was scarcely a week in which several citizens were not executed, and often a great number were dispatched at one time." Upon its fate had depended, as if by common consent, the whole destiny of the anti-Catholic party. It fell, and the consternation was extreme, and the general submission immediate, and even abject. Other important places accepted their garrisons without a murmur. Even Antwerp had made its last struggle, and as soon as the back of Orange was turned, knelt down in the dust to receive its bridle. The country was desolate indeed. Its ancient charters were superseded by brute force, its industrious population were swarming from the land in droves, as if before a pestilence; in every village gibbets

and scaffolds were erected, and there was universal a sickening apprehension of still darker disasters; for on the 15th of April, the Duke of Alva left Spain to go and crush out every vestige of the liberties of this people, which had for centuries enjoyed a nearly complete self-government. Thus was Philip become, by every reasonable construction of history, an unscrupulous usurper, attempting to become the absolute monarch of a free people. It was he that was attempting a revolution; while William, according to his well-known motto, was *maintaining.*

Choosing exile in Germany, rather than behold the ruin of the country he can not then save, Orange sets out for Dillenburg, the ancestral seat of his family, upon the 22d of April, 1567. He once more warns Egmont and Horn of their own impending fate. The Regent had thanked the former for his loyalty. The King himself had especially written him a commendatory epistle. Yet the royal hand had already signed the counts' death-warrant, and it was even then in Alva's possession! As for William, the Duke had Philip's orders to arrest him immediately, and not to let his trial last over twenty-four hours.

Alva comes to the Netherlands. He demands the keys of the chief cities. Egmont and Horn are arrested, and the populace are in consternation. The Duke establishes a new court, called the Council of Troubles, but better known, and to be for ever known in history, as the Blood Council. It superseded all other courts and all other councils. It was an absolute and thorough violation of all charters, laws, and privileges. It defined and it punished treason. It was treason to have signed any petition against the new bishops, the inquisition, or the edicts; to have tolerated public preaching, under any circumstances; to have omitted resistence to the image-breaking, to the field-preaching, or the presentation of the Request; to have asserted that the King did not possess the right to deprive all the provinces of their liberties; or to have maintained that the present tribunal

was bound to respect, in any manner, any laws or any charters. Such was treason. The punishment of it was instant death, in all cases. In three months from the time of its creation, eighteen hundred persons suffered death by the summary proceedings of this tribunal.

The provinces were in despair. Margaret of Parma shortly gets leave to retire from her post of regent, and leaves the control of all affairs to this dreadful military chief. The principal cities are fortified against their own inhabitants. In particular, the citadel of Antwerp is in a few months erected and prepared, by the labors of two thousand workmen, at a cost of fourteen hundred thousand florins, of which the citizens of Antwerp, whom it was built to terrify and to tame, had to pay more than one-fourth.

On the 19th of January, 1568, Orange and sundry other nobles are summoned to appear before the Council of Blood. The Prince replied by a brief and contemptuous plea to the jurisdiction. As knight of the Fleece, as a member of the German Empire, as a sovereign prince in France, as a citizen of the Netherlands, he rejected the authority of Alva and his self-constituted tribunal. Meanwhile, he still maintained an attitude of dignified respect to the monarch, while he hurled back with defiance the insolent summons of the viceroy; for he knew how much strength was to be derived from putting an adversary irretrievably in the wrong.

Events now marched with rapidity. William's eldest child, the Count de Buren, left, by a remarkable oversight of his wise father, to pursue his studies in the college of Louvain, is seized as a hostage for the Prince's good behavior, and carried into indefinite captivity in a foreign land. Then, upon the 16th of February, 1568, a sentence of the holy office condemns all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death as heretics, excepting only a few persons, whose names were given. The two imprisoned nobles also were now brought to trial, after having lain in confinement for two months. The charge of treason, as treason had been

defined by the Blood Council, it was not difficult, of course, to prove against either of them, or against almost any other Netherlander. But the difficulty in the way of their condemnation was, that as knights of the Fleece, it was only that famous order which had jurisdiction of their crimes. But Alva, by the aid of President Viglius, soon disposed of that difficulty, by a bold declaration that the statutes of the Fleece did not extend to such crimes as those charged against these nobles. Of course, Philip sustained the viceroy—the execution of these nobles had been settled before Alva left Spain. A despot like Philip the Second scrupled not at any arbitrary act. As the constitutions of the Netherlands and the statutes of the Fleece stood in his way, it was necessary to stride over those constitutions, and to set aside those statutes. The sentence against them, signed by Philip in blank, had been brought in Alva's portfolio from Madrid. The proceedings against them were a mockery. Rights and justice were abrogated throughout the land. The whole country was under martial law. The entire population was under sentence of death.

Where now is William of Orange? Proscribed, outlawed, his Netherlands property confiscated, his eldest child kidnapped, surely he has private reasons enough to justify him in rebellion, were there no public grounds for it whatever. The prospects of any such movement are dark enough. The Spaniards, under the first military chieftain of the age, are encamped and entrenched in the provinces. The Huguenots have just made a fatal peace in France. The leading men of liberal views in Netherlands are captives or in exile. Confiscations have severed the nerves of war. The country is terror-stricken, paralyzed, motionless, abject, forswearing its convictions, and imploring only life. At such a moment as this, the Prince reappears upon the scene. Early in the summer of 1568, he publishes to the world his justification of all his past acts, and then begins to make war. He gets help in Germany; he has hopes from England.

He commissions his brother Louis and other friends to levy troops. Some of the cities of the Netherlands send him funds. Refugee merchants in England do the same. He sells his jewels, plate, tapestry, etc., of regal magnificence, and his gift to the treasury of the army is fifty thousand florins. Others of the patriot leaders imitate his example. But his first army of three thousand men, under De Villars, were shamefully beaten by less than half their number of Spaniards, under Sancho de Lodroño, and that notwithstanding they were entrenched. This signal misfortune happened on the 25th of April. Towards the end of June, another force of two thousand five hundred men took the field, under De Cocqueville, and were cut to pieces on the 18th of July—scarce three hundred escaped. Meanwhile, at the end of May, Louis of Nassau had gained the victory of Heiliger Lee, over the imprudent Aremberg. But it was a barren victory, and it cost the life-blood of young Adolphus of Nassau, brother of William and Louis. Alva is enraged beyond measure at this defeat. The lion is roused. The executions of Egmont and Horn are hastened, and the Duke takes the field in person against Louis. On the 21st of July, he totally routs him at Jemmingen. But *seven* Spaniards were killed, while *seven thousand* rebels perished, partly by the sword and partly in the river. The wounding, killing, burning, and drowning, lasted two days, and very few of the whole army escaped. Louis himself got off naked, and by swimming the Ems. There followed this slaughter of the army all the horrors of barbarous war, inflicted upon old men and upon females. The earth, as Alva marched back to Groningen, was made red with blood, and the sky with conflagration.

The insurrection being thus quelled in Friesland, Alva returned triumphant to Brussels. All unsoftened by success, the butchery of the Reformed there began again, under the Duke's auspices. Hundreds of martyrs, some eminent personages, were tortured unto death.

William of Orange is not disheartened by these sad reverses, although many of his friends urge him to suspend his warlike efforts. The Landgrave William, the Elector Augustus, the Emperor himself, all urged him to sit still for the present. But he knew well how little good would come of such moderation on his side. And he felt that the more impenetrable the darkness now gathering over that land of doom which he had devoted his life to defend, the more urgently was he forbidden to turn his face away from it in its affliction. He had by this time become himself a Protestant, at first of Lutheran, but subsequently of Calvinistic faith. But he was no more now than before a bigot. Toleration, now in almost all eyes a vice, he had long held, and now even more than ever, to be a virtue. "Should we obtain power over any city or cities," he wrote, in his letter of instructions to his most confidential agent, John Bazius, "let the communities of papists be as much respected and protected as possible. Let them be overcome, not by violence, but with gentle-mindedness and virtuous treatment." He considered his undertaking for the Netherlands a mission from God, and, with simple trust, he looked up to God for help in the work to which he had been called. It was this inward principle of evangelic faith which made William of Orange *sævis tranquillus in undis*—never more tranquil than when the storm was wildest and the night darkest.

And thus did the sovereign of an insignificant little principality stand boldly forth to do battle with the most powerful monarch in the world. At his own expense, and by almost superhuman exertions, he had again assembled nearly thirty thousand men. He crosses the Rhine, and then the Meuse, and boldly offers battle to Alva. But the Duke had determined upon his tactics, and would not fight. His plan was to overcome his enemy by delay. This army of the Prince was the last hope of the patriots. The winter alone would soon disperse these German mercenaries; for

without victory they would get neither pay nor plunder. He would, therefore, parry the strokes of his adversary, but not give him battle. He would hang upon his skirts, follow him move by move, check him at every turn, harass him continually, and foil all his enterprises, but not fight him.

The campaign lasted about one month. Twenty-nine times the Prince changed his encampment, and at every remove the Duke was still behind him, as close and as impalpable as his shadow. Thrice were they within cannon shot of each other, twice without a single trench between them. Orange's soldiers were maddened and tantalized by these tactics. They were constantly in the presence of an enemy who seemed to court a battle at one moment, and at the next to vanish like a phantom. There was but one important action in the campaign, and that was favorable to the Duke. The Prince was disappointed, not only in the hope of a general battle, but also, and still more bitterly, in the supineness of the country. Not a single city opened its gates to him. All was crouching, silent, abject. Had a brilliant victory been obtained, perhaps the rising of the people would have been universal. There was no victory at all, and no rising at all. William sought to carry his army into France, to try the fortunes of the civil war, but in vain. They insisted on being led back into Germany. He disbanded them at Strasburg, making up in promises to them what he could not pay in money.

Thus triumphantly for Alva, and thus miserably for Orange, ended the campaign. Thus hopelessly vanished the armies of the Prince. Eight thousand had he lost in paltry encounters, and thirty thousand had he been compelled to disband. All his funds had been wasted, and no result. There seemed no hope for the Netherlands. But the war of freedom had been renewed in France, and with twelve hundred mounted men, who were willing to follow his fortunes, William, with his brothers, Louis and the

youthful Henry, set forth in the following spring to join the banner of Condé.

The haughty, and now apparently omnipotent Duke, returns to Brussels, and almost assumes the god. He institutes a succession of triumphant festivals, and requires the people to rejoice and strew flowers in his path, although coming to them covered with the blood of men who had striven in their defence. He goes farther, and rears a colossal statue of bronze to himself, as having "extinguished sedition, chastised rebellion, restored religion, secured justice, established peace!"

To add to the disappointments of the Prince, the Emperor of Germany, who had at first espoused his cause with apparent frankness, so far as friendly mediation went, now courted Philip's favor. The King had become a widower again, and the Emperor, among his sixteen children, had more than one marriageable daughter. If it were good to be the guardian of religious freedom in upper and nether Germany, it were better to be the father-in-law to the King of Spain and to both the Indies.

There arose at this time a quarrel between Queen Elizabeth and the haughty Duke of Alva. But neither the torrent of his wrath against the English sovereign, nor the complacency of his triumph over the Prince of Orange, could for a moment cause a pause in that which was his main pursuit. He was zealously engaged in enforcing the edicts with fire and with sword. But the murder of heretics had not proved as lucrative a business as he had expected. Confiscations must of necessity offer but a precarious supply to any treasury. Only the frenzy of an Alva could suppose it might form a permanent revenue. He was now determined to exhibit, by still more fierce, and in one sense ludicrous experiments, how a great soldier may be a very paltry financier. His promise to Philip had been, that a stream of gold a yard deep should flow into Spain from the provinces, the value of which should be two millions yearly

over and above all expenses of the army and government in the Netherlands. He now forms a scheme of arbitrary taxation by the crown, to be substituted for the legal and constitutional taxation of the provinces by themselves. A general assembly of the provincial estates is summoned at Brussels, and decrees are laid before them, instituting,

I. A tax of the hundredth penny, or one per cent., upon all property, real and personal, to be collected instantly; this, however, was not a perpetual tax.

II. A perpetual tax of the twentieth penny, or five per cent., upon every transfer of real estate.

III. A perpetual tax of the tenth penny, or ten per cent., upon every article of merchandise or personal property, to be paid as often as it was sold.

The consternation in the assembly was extreme. He was touching the nerve that lay in their pockets. Comparatively few men of any nation will suffer martyrdom for religious or political principle, but opposition to material and financial tyranny will generally be unanimous. Alva struck at every Netherlander now, and struck where all must be sensitive. The tenth-penny tax was absolutely monstrous; for the same article might be sold ten times a week, and might, therefore, pay away its whole worth in that space of time. The infantine simplicity of the scheme seemed a thing incredible. The ignorance was as sublime as the tyranny. But the Governor-General would listen to no arguments; his determination was as stern as it was stupid and absurd.

Here was the beginning of an earnest popular resistance to the tyrant. The city of Utrecht distinguished herself for her stubborn opposition to this taxation, and lost all her charters by it, for the time. The various assemblies of the patrimonial provinces, one after another, exhausted, frightened, hoping that no serious effort to collect the tax would be made, did, indeed, all consent, under certain restrictions, to its imposition. But they soon withdrew their consent,

as having been obtained by violence or fraud. Compromises were finally agreed to, which postponed the final struggle.

Alva grows sick of his office. His power is evidently on the wane, for the King did not heartily approve the wisdom of his financial measures. His brutality, also, had overshot the mark, and produced disgust amongst some who at first supported him heartily. He earnestly begs to be recalled from his post.

Toward the end of the year 1570, occurred an unexampled inundation, more disastrous in its effects upon the Netherlands than even the famous deluge of the thirteenth century, which gave birth to the Zuyder Zee. The people felt that the hand of God was upon them. As for the Spaniards, they loudly maintained that the vengeance of Heaven had descended upon the abode of heretics. The poor Netherlanders seemed to be doomed to destruction by both God and man.

In France, affairs grew almost as black for the cause of freedom as in the Netherlands. Condé is killed at the battle of Jarnac, and Coligny overthrown at that of Moncontour. Dark indeed were these years of 1569 and 1570 for the Reformed cause every where; but in these darkest hours for his country, never did William of Orange despair. In the autumn of 1569, he returns to Germany; but Count Louis remains with the Huguenots. The deadly peace between them and the court of France succeeded, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew was hastening on. Never had William been in so forlorn a condition as on his return from France. He had no funds to raise new levies, and was daily exposed to annoying claims from his disbanded soldiers. A deep gloom seemed to settle upon his cause. Yet was his spirit unbroken. His letters of this period show a perfect appreciation of the situation, but were also full of modest but lofty courage and pious resignation, without one trace of desponding weakness.

Early in 1571 were renewed the struggles of the Duke and the estates about the taxes. The estates were satisfied that the King was less in earnest than the viceroy. The supple Viglius is satisfied of the waning power of the Duke, and openly turns against him.

Meanwhile, Orange is slowly gathering funds from the gifts of many obscure persons, and the daring exploits of "the beggars of the sea," or privateers, who had sailed under his commission. His emissaries were sent every where, and actively canvassed the governments and peoples of Germany. To the Northern courts his missions had failed. Sweden and Denmark received his envoys with barren courtesy. He furnishes his ambassadors with documents from his own hand, pleading for arms and other assistance. These missives were stamped with the warm religious impress of the Reforming party. Sadly, but without despondency, they recalled the misfortunes of the past, and depicted the gloom of the present. Earnestly, but not fanatically, they stimulated hope, and solicited aid for the future.

At the same time, the affairs of Alva with the estates reached a crisis. The citizens were in open revolt against the taxes. In order to escape the levy of the tenth penny, no goods were sold at all. Not only the wholesale commerce of the provinces was suspended, but the minute and indispensable traffic of daily life was at a stand. The shops were all shut. The brewer would not brew, nor the baker bake. Alva is furious. He orders the hanging of eighteen of the butchers and bakers of Brussels, at their own doors. This was his method of giving a stimulus to trade. The hangman is getting ready his cords and ladders. Alva grimly waits for the rising dawn, which is to usher in his speedy triumph over the obstinacy of the tradesmen. An unforseen event arrests the tragedy. In the night arrives the news of the capture of Brill, by Orange's sea-beggars, under Admiral William de la Marck. A reconciliation

had been effected between Alva's government and that of Queen Elizabeth, and the Netherland privateersmen had been ordered out of the English ports. It looked like a fresh misfortune for Orange; but it was a blessing in disguise. De la Marck's fleet of twenty-four vessels, nearly starving, appear before Brill, and as they must land to get food, William de Blois, the bold seigneur of Treslong, persuades the Admiral to demand the surrender of the town. The magistrates, in terror, flee the city, and it is taken. The corner-stone of the Batavian republic is laid.

Count Bossu is ordered by Alva to retake the town, but he fails. He turns towards Rotterdam, and finds the gates closed against him. Professing perfect loyalty, the inhabitants refuse to receive a garrison to enforce their obedience. By a perfidious stratagem, he is admitted, and four hundred citizens are murdered, and the women meet a fate worse than death. The city of Flushing, on the island of Walcheren, is the first that vibrates with the patriotic impulse given at Brill, and revolts. The example is followed by nearly all the important towns of Holland and Zeeland. With one fierce bound of enthusiasm, the nation shakes off its chain. The first half of the year 1572, is distinguished by a series of triumphs, rendered still more remarkable by the reverses which followed at its close. City after city, in Gelderland, Overyssel, and the see of Utrecht, all the important towns of Friesland, accepted the garrisons of the Prince, and formally acknowledged his authority. The stadtholderate over Holland and Zeeland, to which the Prince had been appointed in 1559, he now reassumed. Upon this fiction reposed the whole provisional polity of the revolted Netherlands. There was no claim, at first, of freedom, beyond what was secured by Philip's coronation oath. There was no pretence that Philip was not sovereign, but there was a determination to assert freedom of conscience, and to reclaim their ancient political liberties. The purpose of William, and of the people, was to recover

historical rights, and to shake off a sanguinary and usurping tyranny.

Louis of Nassau, meanwhile, performs a daring feat—the surprise and capture of the important frontier town of Mons. Alva is in dismay at the suddenness of all these blows. Moreover, he is without money, and is compelled to offer an abolition of the whole tax, upon condition of the payment annually of two millions of florins by the estates. He issues a summons on the 24th of June, for them to assemble on the 15th of July. His healing measures come too late. The estates did meet on the appointed day; but not at the Hague, as he proposed, but at Dort; and not in obedience to his call, but that of Orange. They met at his call as the representative of Philip, and by the authority of Philip, to wage war against Philip. They vote the most liberal supplies. They will give the whole, if necessary, to William, rather than the tenth to Alva—to their liberator all, rather than any thing to their destroyer. They also declared William the King's lawful stadtholder over Holland, Zeeland, Friesland and Utrecht. They ordain freedom of worship, both to Roman Catholics and the Reformed. They make William supreme dictator, and it was reserved for this patriot himself, by an act supplemental to their proceedings, to impose limits upon his own power.

Now begins a series of terrible reverses to the Prince and his cause. Genlis, with reinforcements for Louis, from France, is routed by the Spaniards, and Louis himself closely shut up in Mons. William takes the field with an army of fifteen thousand foot, seven thousand horse, and about three thousand other Walloon troops. He found it hard to restrain his half-paid soldiers, when the city of Roermond was taken, on the 23d of July. Yet the difference was vast between a leader like him, who restrained excesses to the utmost of his power, and Alva, who inculcated robbery, rape, and arson, upon his army as their duty.

As he marched onwards, city after city, including Mechlin, submitted cheerfully to his authority. He was sanguine of French help, notwithstanding the sacrifice made by Genlis of his army. He allowed himself to boast that Alva was in his power, and that the Netherlands would soon be free. Then it was that the earthquake of St. Bartholomew's day appalled all christendom with him, and scattered all his well-matured plans and legitimate hopes. It is not long before his army mutinies, and dissolves into nothing. Mons capitulates. The terms of the capitulation are horribly violated by the Spaniards. The keys of that city unlock every other in Brabant and Flanders. The towns all hasten to disavow the Prince, and to return to their ancient, hypocritical, and cowardly allegiance. Unhappy Mechlin is selected for an example. Alva's soldiers are to be paid their arrears at its expense. Three days did the sack continue; one for the Spaniards, and two more for the Walloons and Germans. No rank, no age, no sex, no religious faith, was spared. Roman Catholics, as well as the Reformed, were freely made victims. Thus was poor Mechlin abandoned to that trinity of furies which ever wait on the footsteps of War—Murder, Lust, and Rapine.

And now there follow what our author calls three thorough massacres. Zutphen, Naarden, and Harlem are sacked; and the story is in each case sickening. When Zutphen fell, and was given up by the cruel Duke to his ferocious soldiery, he piously remarked that it was "*a permission of God* that these people should have undertaken to defend a place so weak." Similar to this was the Christian language of Mendoza, relative to the fall of Naarden: "It was a chastisement which must be believed to have taken place by the express permission of Divine providence; a punishment for having been the first of the Holland towns in which heresy built its nest, whence it has taken its flight to all the neighboring cities." As for the siege of Harlem, it is a story of unexampled heroism. Riperda, the stout

commandant of the little garrison, assembled the citizens and soldiers together in the market-place, warned them, by the fate of Mechlin, Zutphen, and Naarden, of the terrors before them, should they be base enough to surrender the city, and urged them to make no composition with foes as false as sanguinary, but to make one last vigorous effort for freedom. They did make it. There were about one thousand delvers, three thousand fighting men, besides three hundred fighting women, all armed with sword, musket, and dagger. With such a spirit in the maids and matrons of the city, it might be expected that the men would not surrender without a struggle. It was fierce, and bloody, and long continued. The most daring sallies were frequently made, the most patient labors were cheerfully undergone; men, women, and children, working day and night to repair the breaches in the walls as fast as the enemy could make them. They encountered the besiegers not only with sword and musket, but with heavy stones, boiling oil, and live coals. Hoops smeared with pitch and set on fire were dexterously thrown upon their necks. As fast as the Spaniards mined, the citizens countermined; and Spaniard and Netherlander met daily in deadly combat within the bowels of the earth. The siege continued all through the winter and early spring. William of Orange did all that was possible for him, in the vain endeavor to give succor to the devoted city. Batenburg's expedition for their relief was a miserable failure. He was probably intoxicated in the time of the action. At length the city surrendered at discretion, on the 12th of July. Next day the massacre commenced. Six hundred Germans of the garrison were dismissed on oath to fight no more. The remaining twelve hundred were butchered, with at least as many more of the citizens. Five executioners were kept constantly at work, with their attendants. Three hundred wretches were tied two and two, back to back, and drowned

in the Harlem lake. At last, after twenty-three hundred executions, the farce of a pardon was enacted.

The reduction of Harlem is an event which makes us wonder equally at human capacity to inflict and to endure misery. If it was a triumph to the Spaniards, it was one they might well have given in exchange for a defeat. Twelve thousand of them had died of wounds and of disease during the seven months of the siege. The Spaniards celebrated their victory, but it was evident their empire could not endure many such. If it required thirty thousand choice troops to conquer, in seven months, the weakest city of Holland, with a loss of twelve thousand men, how long a time, and how many deaths, would it take to reduce the rest of that little province? The sack of Naarden had inflamed instead of subduing the spirit of Dutch resistance; and the long and glorious defence of Harlem operated to strain to the highest pitch the patriotic hatred of her sister cities. All the treasures of the New World would not suffice to pay for the conquest of the little sand-bank thus defended by its heroic inhabitants.

The Spaniards were exultant, but Orange was neither dismayed nor despondent. His trust was in a higher power than man's. "Since it has otherwise pleased God," he writes to Count Louis, "we must conform ourselves to the divine will. I take the same God to witness, that I have done every thing, according to my means, which was possible, to succor the city." When, after a few days, the Zeelanders capture the castle of Rammekens, on the island of Walcheren, he writes to his brother, in the same spirit: "I hope this will reduce the pride of our enemies, who, since the fall of Harlem, have thought they were about to swallow us alive. I assure myself, however, that they will find a very different piece of work from the one which they expect."

The tide of tyranny is at the flood, and now it begins to ebb. The government makes some awkward and fruitless

attempts at conciliation. The Spanish troops shew signs of mutiny, and even make secret overtures to Orange. With difficulty, Alva restores obedience. The town of Alkmaar is besieged. Sonoy, the lieutenant-governor for Orange of the province of North Holland, an experienced officer, is uneasy at the prospect of the unequal conflict. All looked instinctively to the Prince in every danger, and their hopes were that he had made some foreign alliance that would save them. Sonoy looked, and Sonoy hoped, as did the rest. The Prince's answer to him was full of lofty enthusiasm, such as Christian faith can best inspire. "You ask," says he, "if I have entered into a firm treaty with any great king or potentate; to which I answer, that before I ever took up the cause of the oppressed Christians in these provinces, I had entered *into a close alliance with the King of kings;* and I am firmly convinced that all who put their trust in Him shall be saved by His almighty hand. The God of armies will raise up armies for us, to do battle with our enemies and His own." In conclusion, he stated his preparations for attacking the enemy by sea as well as land, and encouraged Sonoy and the citizens to maintain a bold front.

When the Spaniards assault the town, resistance is made by every man, woman and child. Three times the attack is made, and three times repulsed. Darkness puts an end to the strife. The next day, the order is given to renew the assault, but the Spanish soldiers refuse to attempt it. The place was protected by more than mortal powers; else how could a few half-starved fishermen have so triumphed over the legions of Spain. Some of them were run through the body for disobedience, but still they refused, and the assault was indefinitely postponed. Finally, the Spaniards discovering that the dykes were about to be opened, so as to flood them with the ocean, the siege was raised.

Meanwhile, the court of France assumed a tone of compunction for the bloody deed of St. Bartholomew, and Orange reluctantly enters into negotiations with it again.

He also puts forth another appeal to the patriotism of his country, in an address to the general assembly of the Netherlands. At the same time, he puts into circulation one of the most vigorous and impassioned productions which ever came from his pen. It was "An Epistle, in form of supplication, to his royal Majesty of Spain, from the Prince of Orange and the estates of Holland and Zeeland."

Three days after the deliverance of Alkmaar, the patriots meet with another success. It was a victory on the Zuyder Zee, by Admiral Dirkzoon, with twenty-five ships, over Count Bossu, with thirty, larger and more heavily armed. The victory was complete, and Admiral Bossu was sent a prisoner to Holland. On the 17th of November, 1573, Requesens arrives in Brussels, to succeed Alva; and on the 18th of December, the Duke gladly, yet in deep humiliation, takes his departure for ever from the Netherlands.

Our author well remarks, that although his military fame was unquestionable when he came to the provinces, yet he left them a baffled man. As Alva penetrated into the heart of the ancient Batavian land, he found himself overmatched by the spirit of national freedom, (more audacious, more inventive, more desperate, than all commanders,) as he had never been, even by the most potent generals of his day. The same lesson had been read in the same thickets by the Nervii to Julius Cæsar, by the Batavians to the legions of Vespasian. And now a loftier and a purer flame glowed within the breasts of these descendants of the same people. Alva came to deal with them as with conquered provinces, but he found that the conquest still had to be made, and he left the country without having accomplished it. Neither his legions nor his strategy availed him against an entirely desperate people. He proved himself utterly deficient in every attribute requisite in a man appointed to deal with a free country in a state of incipient rebellion.

These are certainly wise and just reflections, and evince that the author has not studied history in vain. It had

been well for that United States government, which he is now representing, we believe, at some court in Europe, if they had carefully read and pondered deliberately this page of his work, before they sent their Butlers, and Hunters, and McClellans, upon similarly preposterous, absurd, and wicked enterprises, into the states of this Confederacy.

Upon the retirement of the Duke, it was industriously circulated that a change of policy was intended. But, in fact, it would seem that the Spanish government regarded this period merely as a breathing-time, in which "still more active preparations might be made," says the author, employing the term which his countrymen have made so familiar, "for *crushing the rebellion.*" Seven years of executions, sieges, and campaigns, had not brought Philip any closer to the subjugation of the provinces. The new governor was, therefore, authorized to employ concessions, but it was on the basis of the King's absolute supremacy, and the total prohibition of every form of worship except the Roman Catholic. He was authorized to concede to the people a pardon; but it was only in case they would abandon every object for which they had been so heroically contending. Towards the coming of Requesens, therefore, as successor to Alva, all looked forward with indefinite hopes of peace.

Requesens found such a state of the exchequer at Brussels, as to render some little respite to the war an absolute necessity. The army numbered sixty-two thousand men, and forty millions of dollars had been already sunk. The whole annual produce of the American mines, it seemed, would be required to sustain the war. Six and a-half millions of ducats were due to the soldiers. Seven millions of dollars were the yearly necessities of the exchequer, and to meet them, Requesens had not one stiver. He writes to his sovereign: "Before my arrival, I did not understand how the rebels could maintain such considerable fleets, while your Majesty could not support a single one. It ap-

pears, however, that men who are fighting for their lives, their firesides, their property, and their false religion, for their own cause, in short, are contented to receive rations only, without receiving pay." "He saw what few bigoted supporters of absolutism, in any age, have ever comprehended," says Mr. Motley—and the remark is a striking one, as coming from a Yankee author, and a public defender, with his pen, of the Seward-Lincoln war—"that national enthusiasm, when profound and general, makes a rebellion more expensive to the despot than to the insurgents." The policy of the Requesens administration, therefore, in a word, was to deceive the people with the idea of pardon and peace, and so to gain time.

The situation of the patriots, at the same time, was not very encouraging. They had the superiority at sea, but their land forces were mercenaries, constantly mutinying for want of pay. And then Holland was now cut in twain by the loss of Harlem and the leaguer of Leyden. The estates, moreover, were much given to wrangling about economical details. Orange had strong hopes now from France. But he was dreading the effects of the promised pardon upon the spirit of the people.

The chief military events of the administration of the Grand Commander Requesens were, the capitulation of the town of Middelburg, held by Mondragon, to the forces of Orange, and thus the evacuation by the Spaniards of the whole island of Walcheren; the battle of Mook-heath, and the overthrow and death of Louis of Nassau; the mutiny of the Spanish soldiers, and their savage occupation, for a time, of the city of Antwerp, to be renewed, two years later, with all the horrors of massacre and sack; the successful expedition of the Spaniards to the island of Duiveland, and their siege of Zierickzee; the destruction of Spanish fleets of Bergen and Antwerp; and the grand and affecting drama of the siege and the deliverance of Leyden.

The council of nobles was formally abolished on the arrival of the Grand Commander, by letter from Philip's own hand. Negotiations for peace, informal and insincere perhaps, were carried on during the whole summer and autumn of 1574. During the autumn and winter of that year, the Emperor Maximilian actively exerted himself to bring about a pacification. Commissioners of the states and plenipotentiaries of the King met at Breda, in March, 1575. Nothing was effected. On the close of the negotiations, on the 13th of July, each party blamed the other for their failure.

In the course of 1575, the foundation was laid for the union of Holland and Zeeland, under authority of Orange. He was to have absolute power in all matters of the country's defence, while the war lasted. He was to maintain the law, in the King's name, as Count of Holland. He was to protect the exercise of the Reformed, and to suppress that of the Roman religion, without, however, permitting search into any man's creed. William accepted the government July 11th.

A new and improved act of union was duly signed upon the 25th of April, 1576. This was a confederation of the estates, that is, of the knights and nobles of Holland, with the deputies from the cities and countships of Holland and Zeeland. It was a confederation of virtually independent little republics. Each municipality, (says Mr. Motley,) was, as it were, a little sovereignty. Yet, while the various members of the confederacy were locally and practically republics, the general government they established was monarchical. But the whole system was rather practical than theoretical; and so thoroughly was William absorbed in his patriotic work, that it was a small matter with him whether men called him stadtholder, prince, or king. His name amongst the people, from the highest to the lowest, was the name he liked best, and that name was "Father William." He was the father of his country. The vulgar

thought of carving for himself a throne out of the misfortunes of his people, seems not to have entered his mind. Upon one point only had he been peremptory. He would have no persecution for creeds. He stood out resolutely against all meddling with men's consciences. Thought should be toll free.

The expedition to Duiveland was the most brilliant exploit of the war, and was attended with very important results, adverse to William's cause. It cut the province of Zeeland in two, as the sister province of Holland had been severed by previous misfortunes. The Prince is excessively chagrined. He feels that the time is come when foreign assistance must be obtained. Poverty was fast rendering it impossible to keep up the conflict. He and his little country are all alone. He must throw away the fiction of allegiance to Philip, and seek the protection either of France or of England. The estates, early in October, 1575, agreed, unanimously, to declare themselves independent of Philip. Then were resumed fruitless negotiations with the other powers. Germany, England, France, all refused to stretch out their hands to save the heroic but exhausted little provinces. The Prince meditated the sublime but desperate purpose, to collect a numerous fleet, and move the whole population, with their effects, to some new home beyond the seas. The wind-mills were then to be burned, the dykes pierced, the sluices opened in every direction, and the country restored to the ocean, from which it had sprung.

Here we are compelled, for want of space, to arrest our sketch. The way in which Divine providence, at this dark hour, once more interposes for the help of the good cause, by the sudden demise of Requesens, and the consequent confusion of the Spanish councils, we need not recount. We can only refer, in general terms, to the Pacification of Ghent, that masterpiece of diplomacy on William's part, by which he bound together, on the 8th of November,

1576, the estates of Holland and Zeeland, with Brabant, Flanders, and the other provinces. The two former contained a population almost entirely Reformed, but a large portion of the people in the other fifteen provinces were Roman Catholic; and yet they are now united in a toleration of one another's creed, and the effort to drive out the foreign foe. Notwithstanding the fatal difference of religious opinion, they are now at length united in one great hatred and one great hope. There followed, in January, 1577, the celebrated "Union of Brussels"—sent, after its adoption by the states, into every province, that each particular man might be called upon, by signing or refusing to sign it, to range himself either on the side of the fatherland or of despotism. The tenor of the document was to engage its signers to compass the immediate expulsion of foreigners and the execution of the Ghent Pacification; but it also provided for maintaining the Roman Catholic religion and the King's authority, as well as the defence of the fatherland, and all its constitutions. Thus was laid a stepping-stone to the "Union of Utrecht," itself the foundation-stone of a republic destined to endure more than two centuries. The "Union of Brussels" held within itself the seeds of its own destruction. It was impossible that a permanent crystallization should take place, where so strong a dissolvent as the Roman Catholic religion had been admitted. In the sequel, the union fell asunder precisely at this fatal flaw. The next union was one which definitely separated the seventeen provinces into Protestant and Roman Catholic—self-governing republics and the dependencies of a distant despotism. The contracting parties agreed to remain eternally united, as if they were but one province. But at the same time, each was to retain its particular privileges, liberties, and laws. All the ancient constitutions were to be guaranteed. They were to defend each other with "life, goods, and blood," against the King, and all other foes. Every man was to worship God according to the dictates of his

conscience. Thus the seventeen provinces became a state single towards the rest of the world, a unit in its external relations, while permitting internally a variety of sovereignties. The author observes that this differed from the German confederation, in that it acknowledged no single head; from the Achaian league, in the greater weakness of its federal assembly, and the greater fulness of the sovereignty of the individual states; and from the Swiss confederacy, in the more thorough completeness of the union formed. He then distinguishes it from "the American federal commonwealth," in the great feature, that it was to be merely a confederacy of sovereignties, and not a representative republic." "Its foundation was a compact, not a constitution." "The contracting parties were states." "The people of the United States of the Netherlands never assembled—as did the people of the United States of America two centuries later—to lay down a constitution by which they granted a generous amount of power to the union, while they reserved enough of sovereign attributes to secure that local self-government which is the life-blood of liberty." Now, we are neither politicians nor statesmen, nor do we set ourselves up as judges of constitutions and laws, yet we claim to possess (as becomes every citizen) some little knowledge of the Constitution under which we lived, till lately, and of its history. And what little we do know on that subject, is enough to enable us to show, in few words, that our author is far astray in these representations of the Constitution and government of the late United States of America. Those states, when they formed and ratified the Constitution in question, were certainly distinct, independent, and sovereign communities. The thirteen colonies began the contest with Great Britain as distinct communities, and came out of it, severally, sovereign and independent states. Even the Articles of Confederation, (which was merely a league offensive and defensive,) were not ratified by any of the states till three years after the

war began, and two years after independence was declared; and three years more passed away before it was ratified by all of them. During all this period, they were separate and independent states or nations, and had their separate local governments in complete operation. And each, or either of them, might have continued in a condition of separate nationality to this day, had such been its sovereign will or pleasure. And as such sovereign and independent states, they were acknowledged, at last, by the mother country. Now, in what way did the Constitution come to be subsequently set up and established, in the room of the Articles of Confederation? It was first prepared by the states, through their delegates, in convention at Philadelphia, and then it was submitted to the states, separately and respectively, to be approved or rejected by them in their respective conventions, each acting for itself. It was the act of ratification which established it as a constitution between the states so ratifying it, and only between them, on the condition that not less than nine of the then thirteen states should concur in the ratification, as was expressly provided by the seventh and last article of the Constitution. Now, who performed the acts of ratification, except the several states, through conventions of delegates chosen in each state by the people thereof, and acting each in the name and by the authority of its state? And, as all the states ratified it, "we, the people of the United States," (the opening phrase of the preamble,) means, of course, "we, the people of the several states, who do so ratify the Constitution and form the Union. This Constitution, so ratified, was clearly a compact between sovereigns. When the question arose in the convention which framed the instrument, what tribunal should be empowered to decide in doubtful cases of its interpretation, no provision was made; for it was clearly seen that a compact between sovereignties could be interpreted only by each sovereignty for itself. Time and again it was proposed, in the convention, to

make the supreme court "the tribunal to decide in doubtful cases," but not in any form did the proposition prevail. The inference is plain.

Now, this compact between the states of the American Union, was one that came to be broken by some of the sovereignties. Even Mr. Webster, who never leaned too strongly towards state rights, said, in 1851, "If the northern states were to refuse to carry into effect the Constitution, as respects fugitive slaves, the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact. A bargain broken on one side, is a bargain broken on all sides." The northern states did, many of them, formally and deliberately, so refuse; and according, therefore, to the great New England statesman, the Constitution was not only a compact, but a compact broken; a compact broken effectually, and deserving to be discarded for ever. It has been so discarded by the Confederate States. And thus it comes to pass, that the author is living in the days of a struggle for chartered rights, every way greater, though in some remarkable particulars very similar, to the one he so laboriously, eloquently, and, we hope, honestly describes. The contrasts between these two struggles are as striking as the parallels.

A few of these parallels and of these contrasts we shall now briefly suggest.

1. There are the same elements combined in the cause and origin of these two struggles. The Dutch struggle was partly religious and partly political. The inquisition and the charters were the main points at issue. In the present contest, also, religious and political interests commingle. We struggle for our states' rights and our local governments, against a consolidated nationality, to which our fathers never gave consent. And we also struggle for the right of a free people to change their government whenever it becomes dangerous to them. The government at Washington never was, and never shall be, our master-

It never was designed, according to the Constitution, to be any thing but an agent, with limited powers, for the States; and so, in a certain sense, the servant of the States. It is, therefore, the Constitution of our fathers, as against a usurping central despotism, for which we contend; so that (as with the Dutch) not we, but our foes, are the revolutionists. We also struggle for God's word and providence, both impugned by our enemies. It becomes clearer every day, that the war is against slavery, and on religious grounds, in part. It is human reason and human piety against the Bible. If we had been willing to learn from New England wisdom a better religion and morality than the Bible's, this war had never been begun; and even now, all would at once be well again, if we would just consent to be so taught. Thus the struggle is both religious and political.

Another element in the cause and origin of both struggles is money. Alva promised Philip a stream of gold one yard deep, flowing perpetually from the provinces into Spain. The North went into this struggle to recover southern trade. She now prosecutes this war to secure the payment of its enormous cost.

There is a fourth element, which we will call the sectional element. In the case of the Dutch and Spanish there was an absolute difference of race. There is no such difference in the present case, and yet there is a difference of ideas, habits, notions, and ways of feeling, thinking, and acting, which has long constituted us two distinct peoples, and which forms a real element in the present discord. The *true and genuine Yankee* always has been hateful to the South. The whole North, nay, even the whole of New England, is not true and genuine Yankee. Some of the noblest specimens of humanity are here amongst us, who came to us from the now hostile North—and New England itself has furnished some of the very best citizens and soldiers of our Confederacy. But, however this may be, the war, as waged against us, and the government that wages

it, is *true and genuine Yankee.* Yankee principles and Yankee motives originated the war, and Yankee policy controls and conducts it. The press of the North has long been accustomed to sneer at those chivalrous notions upon which the Southron prides himself; and it would, indeed, seem as though the sense of honor, that most important element of high character, is utterly wanting in the North. If there is any thing selfish, base, cowardly, deceitful, in Yankee character, it has all been exhibited in every stage of the policy and conduct of this war upon us by the North. So that the whole North is now become *Yankee* to the people of this Confederacy. The feelings once cherished towards the tricky, mean, meddlesome, unmanly, canting, hypocritical, rapacious Massachusetts or Connecticut man, are now transferred, throughout these states, to all classes at the North. They have all assumed that character, and are acting that way towards us. We did but claim our inheritance of independence and freedom; and, believing themselves able, they have, with one accord, shewed themselves willing, to spoil us of every right for their own advantage. The property, the lives, the liberties of their southern brethren, the very honor of their southern sisters, they would sacrifice it all to their self-aggrandizing malice; whilst the means and the methods they employ, are such that we are at a loss to say which is the most despicable, their cowardice, their deceit, or their cruelty. Sprung from a common ancestry, to a great degree, yet educated under different influences, and trained to contrary ideas and principles, it has come to pass, at length, that one great hatred now unites our people against the whole North, as fierce and undying as ever the Dutch felt for their Spanish foes.

2. There is the same blind infatuation manifest in the two attempts of tyranny. Philip's scheme, to force the inquisition upon the Dutch, and to compel them to give up their charters, was a mad conception, and insane was the

obstinacy with which he sought to carry it into execution. On the part of the North, there is the same infatuation in their belief that they can subjugate us, and the same obstinate persistence in the mad attempt. It is, on their part, a war of delusions—of delusions perfectly easy to account for, as they have been all along, ever since the rise of abolitionism, misled by their own press, and other educators. The South knew the North well, for they took and read their papers. But no southern writing ever reached the North, and so the North fell an easy prey to falsehoods concerning both our slaves and ourselves. Accordingly, they imagined that a union party would be found amongst us. They will not give up the infatuation. They imagined that the non-slaveholders of the South would refuse to take up arms in defence of their own invaded soil. They have not yet awaked up to their tremendous error. They imagined that our slaves would all rise up to welcome them as deliverers. They cling still to this delusion. They imagined our people too soft, luxurious, and effeminate to carry on a determined and protracted struggle. Up to the time of McClellan's late defeats, they still persisted in believing "the rebellion almost crushed out." It remains to be seen how long they will continue to cherish this fond imagination.

3. There is the same popular heartiness in the two efforts to resist despotism. At the beginning, the people of the Netherlands were not hearty. William was, for a long time, the head and front of that movement. But when the Duke of Alva made the case plain to every person, by his tenth-penny tax, then he united all interests against his master. From that moment, the question of Dutch independence was settled. There were, of course, great sufferings to be endured, and great reverses to be met, and many a time thick clouds must appear to settle over William's prospects; but the moment Alva had

united the whole people in one earnest purpose, the case was already a determined one.

It is precisely so in our present struggle. If any did not understand the true nature of the issue at the very beginning, long since it has become perfectly plain to every one. The Yankee government has made all classes in the Confederacy of one mind. This war on our part is, in the strictest sense, a war of the people. It is not a war of our government, but it is our people's war. It is every man's war, and every woman's war, and every child's war. Both sexes, and all ages and classes, unite in its support. As for the women of our country, history shall speak their praise. They have clothed the army fighting, and they have nursed the army sick. Well might the brutal Butler strike so basely at them, in his infamous order concerning their New Orleans sisters—the women of the South are all foes of the Yankee government! There is no class of people in our whole Confederacy that does not heartily endorse and encourage the Confederate cause. The merchant, the planter, the manufacturer, the farmer, the slaveholder and the non-slaveholder, the rich and the poor, the minister and his people, the lawyer, the physician, the inhabitants of the towns and cities, and the rural population; men formerly of all the various political parties, (for there now exist no parties of this sort whatever,) people of all religious denominations alike; in one word, the whole people are united in the struggle.

One consequence is, that in both struggles the spirit of the people is seen to rise with the reverses that come upon them. Once fairly roused, Dutch patriotism only burned the brighter for the thick darkness and gloom that gathered around. The sack of Naarden inflamed, instead of subduing, popular resistance. The terrific siege of Harlem strained to the highest pitch the patriotic devotion of her sisters. And so is it in this Confederacy. There is no sacrifice our people are not now prepared to make, rather

than submit to the rule of a government they have so many fresh reasons to abhor. It is foul with the blood of their sons; it has desolated their cities; it riots in the oppression of some portions of their territory. They felt a warm indignation at the first against the despotism, but their wrath is now hot. They want offensive war; they want blood and fire to be opposed by blood and fire.

4. There is the same high religious confidence that God will give deliverance. Viewing Orange as the embodiment of Netherland feeling and spirit, this is true of the Dutch. But it is true of the people of the Confederate States in a literal sense. We do not mean to assert that all our people are possessed of evangelical faith. But, whilst we see amongst Christian people of every denomination the exhibition continually of a humble reliance on Him who has sore broken us, and of a chastened confidence in His favor to our cause, such as Orange so sublimely expressed when he said, "I have made no treaty with any great potentate on the earth, but I have entered into a close alliance with the King of kings," we behold, also, amongst all classes of the people, a lofty persuasion that this is a great providential movement, by which the states of this Confederacy are certain to become a separate and independent people. This is a wide-spread popular belief. Men who never saw God's hand any where else, can see it in this movement.

Such are some of the broad parallels which strike us, when reading this history in the midst of present events. In innumerable particular circumstances, the parallel is equally visible between our case and that of heroic Orange, battling for right against deceitful, ruthless might. Thus do we encounter once more "the perpetual reproductions of History." But let us hasten to close these observations, by referring to a few of the contrasts distinguishing, so remarkably, from one another these two great movements in the history of constitutional freedom, which, in several respects, are so entirely similar.

1. The present struggle is certainly by far the greater in that which is *at stake.*

The Netherland provinces were not the peculiar home of constitutional freedom in that day; but Americans have long been accustomed to boast that in our age she has been dwelling peculiarly upon this continent. It has long been conceded, that the brightest hopes of mankind for this world have attached themselves to the republican institutions of North America. Holland was little and obscure at the time of her struggle for chartered rights, and had she perished, the cause of regulated liberty had not been either disgraced or overthrown. But to these western shores, the eyes of thousands in older countries have been long turned, with mingled hope and fear. They have watched the solution of the American problem, anxious beyond measure to have it demonstrated that, under certain favorable circumstances, man is capable of what is called *self-government.*

There can be no doubt that the best friends, the most intelligent and sincere friends, of true liberty in Europe, are now full of disquiet for their sacred cause. They behold their best hopes and the dearest temporal interests of mankind in jeopardy. Lord Brougham (no friend to the South) said recently in Parliament, that, "gloss it over as they might, the war threatens fatal results to the character of the American people." It is perceived in Europe, that the government at Washington tramples under foot equally the constitutions of states and the personal franchises of individuals; that they are denying to the men of this Confederacy what is asserted in the Declaration of Independence—the right of every free people to abjure a government not of their own consent; and that their outcry of rebellion against us, and their attempt to force upon us a continuance of the Union, against our will, is a renunciation of the principles of the Americans of 1776, and an unworthy imitation of the mad and wicked attempts of British tyranny at that time. The friends of constitutional

liberty in Europe know how unjust, as well as absurd, is the very idea of restoring the American Union by force. They know that a republic by coercion is an impossibility. They stand aghast at the thought of all these Confederate States being reduced to the condition of subject provinces, simply because they do not choose any longer alliance with the states of the North. They are not asleep to the fatal blow which freedom's cause, the world over, must receive, should so dire a project be crowned with success.

It is such considerations as these which set forth the real importance of the struggle now carried on by us for our chartered rights and immunities. Europe does not yet perceive, but it may one day be made plain to her intelligent and honest statesmen, that it is the Confederate States which, on this continent, are the only assertors of freedom's grand and precious cause; and that here, in the South, the slaveholding South, here, after all, dwells the largest, truest, healthiest liberty in this western hemisphere: liberty not for all, but for the largest possible number; liberty for all capable of using liberty well; liberty for all to whom liberty would be any blessing.

2. There is a striking contrast between these two struggles, as to their *scale and dimensions*. The Netherlands were invaded only by hundreds, and tens of hundreds. Our foe boasts of having sent into our country seven hundred thousand soldiers, and is now calling for three hundred thousand more. There is no end to the number of ships, also, employed to cut us off from intercourse with the rest of mankind, and to penetrate our country with agents and means of terror and destruction. What quantities of powder and shot, what countless numbers of shells, of every sort and size, have been used against us! What vast expenses have been assumed to carry on this invasion! Philip's war cost him, for military expenses, seven millions of dollars per year. Abraham Lincoln's government, it is declared on the floor of their own Congress, have had to

expend, for fourteen months past, that much about every three days!

3. The undertaking of our author's countrymen is in striking contrast with that of Philip of Spain, in the immeasurably greater obstacles which they have cheerfully encountered. It will be for some future Motley—some philosophic historian of another age—to determine whether this Herculean effort illustrates better their courage or their cupidity.

It is manifest that all the material conditions of success were with the Spaniards. "Who could suppose," well remarks Mr. Motley, "that upon that slender sand-bank, that narrow tongue of half-submerged earth, one hundred and twenty miles in length, and varying in breadth from four to forty miles, one man, backed by the population of a handful of cities, could do battle nine years long with the master of two worlds, the '*Dominator of Asia, Africa, and America,*' the despot of the fairest realms of Europe—and conquer him at last? Nor was William entirely master of that narrow shoal. North and South Holland were cut in two by the loss of Harlem, while the enemy was in possession of the natural capital of the little country, Amsterdam."

Was it madness in Philip to suppose that he could subjugate three millions of Netherlanders, united heartily against him? It was some excuse for his folly that he knew that they were inhabitants of a handful of cities, and their country a few petty and insignificant provinces. But now the world looks on and sees the "universally educated," the "shrewd," "smart," "cute," Yankee nation, rushing headlong into the serious endeavor to subjugate ten millions of people, inhabitants of half this continent of North America!

Again: William's soldiers were chiefly mercenaries, and could never stand in the open plain against their accomplished enemies. For the soldiers of Philip were of "ro-

mantic valor, unflinching fortitude, and consummate warlike skill." It followed that the Hollanders were always beaten whenever it came to a fair and open fight on land, although ever superior at sea. In the present case, no comparison on the sea is admissible, for obvious reasons. But how is it on the land—how is it all over that mighty breadth of states which it is attempted to overrun, and to subdue and possess? The defence of our soil is in the hands of natives, or of men who have adopted our country for their own. It is the children of this soil, it is the owners of this land, that have banded together as one man to withstand invasion and rapine. And where, in a single instance during this war, have the men of the South not shewn themselves able, by the blessing and favor of God, to conquer their foes against odds in any fair and open field?

Again: the Netherlander had been, to a large extent, a freeman, and was contending for privileges and charters long enjoyed by him, such as they were. This made his resistance to Philip's attempt at subjugation so spirited and so stubborn. But the people of this Confederacy are the natural-born heirs of British freedom in all its fulness, and have enjoyed, moreover, for eighty years and more, all the rights and immunities of American citizens. What is yet more to the point in hand, they have long been themselves the masters of a subject race. To bring freemen of this kind and of this character under a domination, of all others on the face of the earth the most despicable and odious to them, this is the stupendous enterprise in which the Lincoln government has engaged!

The natural conditions of success were, indeed, all with the Spaniards, except the great, controlling one of their being opposed by a thoroughly roused, and united, and determined people. But the moral conditions of success, such as justice, and truth, and right, were with the Hollanders. In the case of our Confederacy, we have both

the moral conditions and the natural conditions of success all for us. If nothing else would wear out our foe, the country where we dwell will do it. If nothing else would bring him to a state of exhausted weakness, his invading this land of ours will do it. His million of soldiers will melt away like snow upon our fields. But were our country not fitted as it is to devour an invading host—were it far smaller, and far healthier, and far more densely populated than it is, the one circumstance of our people being so united in their purpose, would still make the Yankee scheme a perfectly hopeless one.

Deeply impressed ourselves with the example of patient, cheerful, heroic endurance furnished us by Orange and his Netherland countrymen, we have essayed to set it before our readers, as, perhaps, the best service we could possibly render at this time to the cause of our country. On the 25th of April, 1568, William's first army, of three thousand men, are shamefully beaten by half their own number of Spaniards. On the 18th of the following July, his second army, of twenty-five hundred, is cut to pieces, scarce three hundred escaping. On the 21st of July, Count Louis is totally routed at Jemmingen, and the Spanish loss in the fight is but seven, against as many thousands of William's men. Yet do not these terrible reverses dishearten the hero. At his own expense, and by almost superhuman exertions, he gathers another army, of nearly thirty thousand soldiers; but the masterly tactics of Alva baffle all his schemes of battle, and in about one month this army of wretched mercenaries also disbands, and the campaign ends miserably for the Prince and his cause. But if the year 1568 was dark, yet darker for the Reformed were those of 1569 and 1570. William had gone with his brothers, Louis and Henry, to join the banner of the Huguenots, in France. Condé was killed and Coligny overthrown, and William found himself again in Germany, without funds to raise new levies, nor yet to relieve himself from the annoying

claims of those he had been compelled to disband. But even now his spirit is unbroken; and while he comprehends his own weakness, he is still full of lofty courage and humble confidence in God. Not yet, however, has he sounded the profoundest depths of reverse and misfortune. In 1572, at the head of a new army, justly sanguine of French help, reasonably confident that Alva is now at length in his power, suddenly the earthquake of St. Bartholemew's day scatters all his well-matured plans, and blasts all his legitimate hopes. His mercenaries once more mutiny, and his army again dissolves. And many of the towns and cities of Belgium, which had been quick to raise his successful standard, now disown his cause, and hasten to return to their old allegiance.

These Confederate States have had their reverses, too, and by these reverses their overweening pride and self-confidence have been humbled. This single result has, perhaps, fully compensated for all our sufferings and losses. Sweet are the uses of adversity—wholesome the lessons of necessary discipline. God of our fathers, and our God, grant in mercy that we be not now again unduly uplifted by the great victories vouchsafed our army in Virginia. But what have our reverses been, at any period since the war began, in comparison with those borne by the heroic Dutch with such sublime fortitude?

The portrait of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, which we had hoped to send with the present number, is not yet finished, but we confidently expect that it will be ready for distribution with the January number.

We appeal again to our subscribers to whom we sent bills for arrearages in the last number.

We thank those who have remitted to us the respective amounts of their bills, but we are sorry to add that not more than one in five of all thus appealed to have made any response.

We ask attention once more to the statement before made, that during the last year our receipts were not sufficient to pay the expenses of publication, by several hundred dollars. And although our terms call for payment in advance, we have not yet received enough on Vol. XV. to pay for the two numbers issued, by several hundred dollars. Will our subscribers suffer this to continue to be the case? Or will they not rather aid us by making vigorous efforts to increase our subscription list, as well as by forwarding to us, as soon as possible, payment of arrearages, and of the amount due for the present volume?

P

C

t
t
o
a
c
p
t
(
P
h
v
l
t
s
S
l

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XV.—NO. 2.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

Commentar ueber die Genesis von FRANZ DELITZSCH. *Dritte durchaus umgearbeitete Ausgabe.* Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke. 1860; pp. 648, 8vo.

Silent leges inter arma. In a sense quite different is this true, from that in which the words were pronounced by the Roman orator in his defence of Milo. He affirmed it of the observance of laws, and not of the principles which are their basis. Literature and science, the quiet studies of the scholar, and the profound researches of the philosopher and jurist, are unheeded amid the din of war. When the halcyon days of peace return, it may again be said, *Cedunt arma togæ*, and the sword will be beaten into the plough-share once more, and the spear into the pruning-hook. But when there is on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the waves and the sea roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth, it requires an absorption in study, like that of Archimedes at the capture of Syracuse, to enable one to hold on his way in the ordinary pursuits of the scholar. Halls of learning are deserted of

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XV.—NO. 2.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

Commentar ueber die Genesis von FRANZ DELITZSCH. *Dritte durchaus umgearbeitete Ausgabe.* Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke. 1860; pp. 648, 8vo.

Silent leges inter arma. In a sense quite different is this true, from that in which the words were pronounced by the Roman orator in his defence of Milo. He affirmed it of the observance of laws, and not of the principles which are their basis. Literature and science, the quiet studies of the scholar, and the profound researches of the philosopher and jurist, are unheeded amid the din of war. When the halcyon days of peace return, it may again be said, *Cedunt arma togæ*, and the sword will be beaten into the plough-share once more, and the spear into the pruning-hook. But when there is on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the waves and the sea roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth, it requires an absorption in study, like that of Archimedes at the capture of Syracuse, to enable one to hold on his way in the ordinary pursuits of the scholar. Halls of learning are deserted of

their votaries; professor and pupil, and in many instances the minister and men of his charge, have gone forth to do battle for their country. And the voice of wailing over our slain is heard amid the triumphs of victory. He alone can command attention who discourses on some topic directly connected with this great struggle.

In ordinary times, we could show to the reader's satisfaction that there are topics which cover all time and space occupied by human beings and their acts, more important than those things which agitate us now. Religion lifts its voice in war and in peace, and the sacred books which are the treasure-house of our faith and hope and consolation, are dear to us at all times, and especially in seasons of public sorrow.

The first book of the canonical Scriptures we have always esteemed as one of the most interesting and important in the entire canon. In the same light is it regarded by the author, the title of whose commentary we have placed at the head of this article. The book of Genesis, or of the beginning of the world and man, says he, is the anticipation of the Thora (or Law); and the Thora is the anticipation of the Old Testament; and this, the anticipation of the religion of redemption; and redemption, the anticipation of the present world and its history; so that upon the pillars of this book rests the fabric of our salvation, which projects forward into eternity. What the four Gospels are in the New Testament, the five books of the Law are in the Old. The parallel strikes deep. The Gospel of Matthew agrees, at its commencement, with the Genesis of the Old Testament. It is the *βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; and the Gospel of John has so near a relationship with no Old Testament book as it has with Deuteronomy. Not merely their beginnings, but the beginning and the end of the Old and New Testament canon coincide. Genesis and the Apocalypse, the Alpha and Omega of the canonical Scripture, run into each other, forming a complete circle. The

creation of the present heavens and the present earth upon the first pages of Genesis, answers to the creation of the new heavens and the new earth upon the last pages of the Apocalypse; the first creation, which had for its scope the first Adam, to the new creation, which takes its beginning from the second Adam. Thus the Holy Scripture forms a rounded, finished whole, to show that not merely this or that book, but also the entire canon, is the work of the Holy Spirit. Genesis and the Law in general with its σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, is the sacred root, the Apocalypse, the top of the tree stretching upward into the αἰὼν μέλλων.

Again: he claims that it is an exceedingly important book, on account of its rich contents. What is true of the entire Thora (or Law), is true of Genesis, that it is an unexhausted sea of knowledge, a mine of treasured wisdom not yet lifted to the light, a casket of undiscovered gems and mysteries, for which reason the Lord (Matt. 5: 18) says that ere heaven and earth shall pass away, every ἰῶτα and every κεραία awaits its fulfilment. *Nihil pulchrius Genesi, nihil utilius*, Luther takes pains to say, in reference to its wealth of contents. Indeed, Church exposition has always applied itself with more especial fondness to Genesis than to the other books of the Thora, though a path lies still before it, further than the eye can reach, to the complete understanding of it. The means of understanding and verifying this book lie not only in the depths of the soul, but in the depths of the earth, also, into which the description of the primeval world descends; and not merely the walls of Egyptian temples and catacombs, but the customs of the Tungusians and Delawares, not merely the rubbish of Babylonish ruins and the buried monuments of ancient Assyria, but the heights of the Himalaya and the depths of the Dead Sea, aid in the interpretation of this peculiar book. Its historical contents stretch over a term of two thousand three hundred years; or, more exactly, two thousand three hundred and six years, from the creation to the

death of Joseph. If we divide the whole history into the two great halves of a history of the primeval world and a history of the contemporaneous period, separated by the introduction of sin and the counsel of redemption consequent thereon, then the three first chapters contain a complete history of the primeval world; and the history of the author's own times follows, in three periods, of which the first reaches from the fall to the flood (ch. 4–8 : 14); the second from the covenant with Noah to the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of nations (ch. 8: 15—ch. 11); the third from the vocation of Abraham to the settlement of Jacob's family in Egypt (ch. 12–50). These are the three first stages in the history of salvation, according to which, in divine mercy, universal and national history assumes its form. This universal and national historical foundation of the history of salvation gives to Genesis a richness of contents incomparable within the canonical literature.

The author argues the exceeding importance of this book from its very high antiquity in comparison with the literature of other nations, and even this inspires us with confidence in it. The Vedas in their present form were probably not composed after the seventh century before Christ, but were written not much earlier than this; the Rigveda only, Wilson, after the example of Colebrooke, removes back to the fourteenth or fifteenth century before Christ, and therefore to the Mosaic period, yet by a very unsafe conjecture. Of the Zend-books, those written in the later dialect, according to the investigations of Spiegel, belong to about the time of Alexander the Great; those in the older dialect are, notwithstanding this, later than Artaxerxes the Third, and scarcely as old as Cyrus. None of these books proceeded from Zoroaster himself. The Schuking of Confutse (Confucius) is of the sixth century before Christ. The question whether it contains older fragments, is, according to Gutzlaff's statement, still undecided. Only a few Egyptian papyri can measure in antiquity with the

Thora, and these, in comparison with it, are only annalistic fragments of limited contents. The Thora is a many-membered historical work, possessing unity of plan, embracing the entire world, and dating back to the sixteenth century before Christ, to which only a few of the papyrus rolls in the Egyptian collections at London, Turin, Leyden, and Berlin, reach back.

In words of similar import to these, does Delitzsch speak of the importance of the book of Genesis. Indeed, if it did not stand at the vestibule of the inspired Scriptures, how almost inexplicable would the whole volume which opens the plan of redemption be to us, and how many questions of interest to ourselves and to the entire race, as to the world and man, as to our moral disease and its remedy, as to the origin of nations and the Church of God, would be incapable of solution.

From the highest and sublimest summits of our New Testament Scriptures, we may well say, with Gregory of Nazianzen, "Let us descend to Moses, the Ocean of Theology, from which come all the rivers and every sea." *Πρὸς Μωυσέα καταβαίνωμεν, τὸν τῆς θεολογίας ὠκεανόν, ἐξ οὗ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.* For, as every portion of the New Testament presupposes the Old, so does every portion of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments presuppose this sacred book, in which the sources, if not of their wisdom, yet of their just interpretation, are found.

The interpretation of Genesis has reflected the different periods of Old Testament exegesis. The theological interpretation began with the Church Fathers, but was perverted and obscured by a foolish fondness for allegory. In Augustine, for example, against the Manicheans, the story of Eden is lost in clouds and vapor. Paradise stands for the *felicity of man*, the four streams are the *four virtues*, the *coats of skins* are a *life of immortality*, the cherubim are the *plenitude of knowledge*, the flaming sword is *temporal punishment*. He, however, afterwards, in his retractions, admits

that he had carried the figurative interpretation too far. The Middle Ages followed chiefly in the same track. By insisting on this spiritualizing and ethical method, all true exegesis was rendered impossible. The period of the Reformation, on the contrary, brought the verbal sense into favor, the word being valued as containing an exhaustless fulness of truth. The Holy Spirit, says Luther, is the simplest writer and speaker in heaven or in earth. His words can have no more than one simple sense, the one right, chief sense, which the letters give. His Latin Commentary on Genesis, which embodies his lectures on this book continued through a period of ten years and finished three months before his death, is the precious and ripe fruit of a true spiritual recognition of the letter of the Old Testament, and marks an era in Old Testament exegesis. But Calvin's distinguished gift for exegetical labors, his sagacious and penetrating mind, his earnestness of soul, and his knowledge which had its root in a deep experience of the things of God, give an unspeakable value to his Commentary on this book. In him the theological exposition of the Pentateuch reached its height. The Commentaries of these two reformers, contain more than all the Church Fathers put together; and in theological interpretation, in which Calvin especially excels, more than all who have followed after.

The Commentaries of Calovius and Gerhard among the Lutherans, and of John Mercerus among the Calvinists, are to be mentioned with respect. On the contrary, the two Arminian interpreters, Grotius and Le Clerc, regard Genesis from a mere deistical point of view—from one almost profane—and wholly foreign from that which reigns throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. Between these two writers appeared the celebrated work of Spencer, at that time head of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge. This work, which has had no small influence on subsequent writers, traces the rites of the Mosaic ritual to a heathen origin,

and holds that they were adopted by God to meet the superstitious feelings of the Jews, because they were consecrated by long use among many nations, and some of them He knew to be "*endurable trifles.*" He held it to be probable that God delivered some things of peculiar sanctity under the veil of symbols and types, on account of a similar custom among the wise men of heathen nations, especially the Egyptians. He thus gave to all these rites a low and human origin; they were adopted by God on the low ground of expediency, and not with the view of foreshadowing the great atoning work which was to be accomplished in the person of His Son, and of setting forth our need of redemption through His blood.

Le Clerc (Clericus) followed in the same line. He takes a low view of all the peculiarities of the Sacred Scriptures. Circumcision is, in his apprehension, a rite so inconvenient, so devoid of decency, contributing so little to good morals, that it could not have been instituted by the Most High. Abraham had witnessed it in Egypt, and was favorably impressed by it; and out of condescension to our weakness, He commanded its practice. He suggests that the tree of life was probably a tree of medicinal virtue, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil a poisonous tree, which the prudent would avoid, but the imprudent would partake of and come to a knowledge of good and evil they did not possess before. The cherubim and flaming sword are explained of the flaming naphtha or bitumen, abounding on the plains of Babylon, as now on the shores of the Caspian, and debarring Adam from Paradise. Miracles are diminished down, and become merely extraordinary natural events; unusual, yet lying within the province of second causes.

John David Michaelis, in his Remarks for the Unlearned, (*Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte,*) and in his Laws of Moses, (*Mosaisches Recht,*) has followed in a path equally objectionable. Professedly, he is an apologist for the Bible,

not in the more ancient and noble sense of the word, but, alas! in the more modern sense. His own political principles, says Hengstenberg, were not the growth of a Christian soil. French writers were his teachers. With an inflated idea of his own supremacy in the walks of biblical learning, and standing almost on the low platform of those objectors to the Scriptures to whom he would recommend them, he patronizingly takes Moses under his protection, and in these intolerably gossiping works seeks to recommend him on the low grounds of political expediency. He attributed to the legislation of Moses a certain kind of artifice, in giving a religious air to rules of mere human prudence. The purification of the camp was made a religious rite, but its simple object was to prevent the existence of that noisome effluvia so apt to exist in such circumstances. The command forbidding the dressing of a kid in its mother's milk, was to accustom the people to dress their food with olive oil, and not with butter which would be less palatable. The prohibition of blood and fat, as belonging to the altar, and appropriate to rites of religious significancy, was really to discourage the use of fat by a people liable to diseases of the skin. Every ceremonial law, he strives to show is based upon some medical, dietetic, or juridical principle, instead of possessing the lofty aim of religious instruction, and of adumbrating that great plan of redemption, which was the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount. The entire arrangements about leprosy, instead of being intended to symbolize the sad disease of sin, are explained as mere sanatory regulations, or as designed to remove the shocking cases of this digusting disease from the eyes of refined society. Moses is thus drawn down into the circle of human legislators, and all reverence for the Bible as the book of God, and of its religion as a direct revelation from heaven, is wholly lost.

This decadence from the true spirit of Old Testament exegesis, reached its lowest depths in Germany in the arbi-

trary and dry Commentary on the Pentateuch, of Vater, 1802–1805; in the learned, but, alas! unbelieving and shameless exposition of Genesis by Peter von Bohlen, in 1835. The Scholia of Rosenmüller, chiefly drawn from Le Clerc, the philologically able *Annotatio perpetua in Genesin*, of G. A. Schumann, and especially the independent, and, in all the externals pertaining to the text, careful Commentary of Tuch, 1838, leave so far a favorable impression, as we see that at last the natural earthly element of sacred history has reached a quiet and ascertained value, after interpretation has so long allegorized and dogmatized, apart from all historical truth. Herder did great service and gained great credit, by slaying rationalism with its own weapons; by teaching men to admire and love the Scripture as a human, popular, oriental, and ancient book, for the beauty of its poetry, the depth of its meaning, and the imperishableness of its contents. But, alas! he had no relish for the Scriptures as a divine revelation, no interest in Christianity as the religion of redemption. But what Herder was for the human side of Scripture, that Hamann became for their divine side. They supplement each other, and together represent the conception of the divine and the human in this wonderful book. Herder stands in the porch, and Hamann upon the threshold of the Holy of Holies. They (says Delitzsch, to whom and to Hengstenberg we are chiefly indebted for this historic view of the exposition of Genesis,) are not alone, but preceded others who have learned to keep in view the divine and the human, the eternal and the temporal, the spiritual and the natural of Scripture. We retain this language of Delitzsch, though aware that, unless properly understood, it may imply an erroneous view of the doctrine of inspiration.

Delitzsch speaks approvingly of the writings of F. C. Freihernn and F. A. Krummacher, as replete with fine ethical hints of profound views of the history of redemption. And he bestows high praise on the unfinished Commentary

of J. N. Tiele, (Erlangen, 1836,) and still higher on the theological Commentary upon the Pentateuch of Mich. Baumgarten, (Kiel, 1843–44,) which he says is the first continued and complete Commentary which holds itself aloof from false spiritualism on the one side and superficial dulness on the other, and seeks to present the grammatico-historical and the spiritual as the two sides of true theological exegesis. These, with the two popular works—"Bible-Hours on the First Book of Moses," by F. J. Ph. Helm, (Stuttgard, 1845,) and "The First Book of Moses, expounded by F. W. J. Schröder," (Berlin, 1846,)—Delitzsch names, as affording delightful security that the Church has ripened to the *ætas virilis ac regia* of Scripture interpretation, and that the thunder-storm of rationalism must have served to bring a new fructifying rain upon the heritage of the Lord.

Omitting various popular works of German scholars and divines on Genesis, of which that of Otto von Gerlach, translated into English, and published in 1860, by Clark of Edinburgh, as part of their theological library, is the best, we come to the work of Delitzsch, now before us. It has reached its third edition, which the author informs us has been wrought over anew, so that but few pages retain their earlier form. The many-sided researches of modern times, so far, at least, as found in the German language, the writer has passed in review, availing himself of whatever could contribute to elucidate this ancient and inspired book. His Commentary is written with much spirit, shows the author to be a man of profound learning, who does not fear to hold forth amid the sceptical scholars of his own land believing views of the Sacred Scriptures, and to trace the successive stages in the plan of redemption which they reveal. The latter part of Genesis, from chapter 12, is dispatched in a manner far too summary. Yet every student of the book knows that the weightier matters, and those which, from the brevity of the narrative and the re-

mote antiquity of the events, require the most extensive research and the most elaborate treatment, are crowded together in the first pages. Delitzsch belongs to the evangelical school of German scholars; still, there are views of his which our readers will be slow to adopt. He has, however, selected his topics with judgment, and comprises in a moderate-sized octavo much learned and suggestive exposition. In our English literature, besides the old and well-known works on the whole Pentateuch; Ainsworth's Annotations, 1699; Kidder, Commentary on the Five Books of Moses, 1713; Parker, Bibliotheca Biblica, 1720, 1735; Jamieson's Critical and Practical Exposition, 1748; we have Graves' Lectures on the Pentateuch, 1815; Bush on Genesis, in 1839, followed by his Commentaries on the other books; Turner's Companion to Genesis, 1841; and Jamieson, (Robert, D. D., of Glasgow,) "The Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, with an original and copious critical and explanatory Commentary," republished by Martien, Philadelphia, 1860—a book which is indeed valuable, but hardly comes up in copiousness to the promise of its title-page.

Of the various points discussed by Delitzsch in his introduction, one of the first is the antiquity of the book of Genesis. The oldest papyri which preceded the Thora, the autographs of the primitive times of which they treat, as well as the autograph of the Thora itself, which was deposited in the Ark of the Covenant, are alike irrecoverably lost. The earliest manuscripts which introduced the Thora to Europe scarcely reach the ninth century of the Christian era. One only, at Odessa, (from Derbend in Daghestan,) boasts of a higher antiquity. Are we, then, justified, he asks, to place the composition of the Pentateuch, including Genesis, in the Mosaic times, and so defy the results of modern criticism, which refer it to a period far later?

To this he replies, that the authenticity of the Thora, and the integrity of its text as well, are securities for the high

antiquity of its composition, which no monument of Egyptian literature can produce. The Jewish people itself, with its entire post-Mosaic history and literature, is the living, unperishable, and infallible papyrus on which, as with the finger of God, the text of the Thora stands written. The post-Mosaic history presupposes the Sinaitic law as already reduced to writing. The post-Mosaic literature, the oldest as well as the latest, utters a many-voiced testimony for the priority of the Thora, in the form in which it lies before us in the Pentateuch. Both these propositions he holds with unlimited assurance against all the hypotheses, in their various forms, which place the composition of the Pentateuch more or less late in the post-Mosaic period.

In proof, he adduces (1) the relations of the post-Mosaic *history* to the Thora. Both the bright and the dark side of this history, presuppose the existence of the Thora. The bright side, because the consecrated nation of Israel, with its worship and institutions, its succession of kings and prophets, as well as all its literary products, points back to the radical unity of a divine documental basis. The dark side, because the constant conflict in which the natural temper of Israel, from the time of the Judges, finds itself with the government of Jehovah, shows that this already had an objective existence in Israel, in the form of a law, which, on this account, could not have sprung from the popular sentiment of that people, but must have been a divine attestation and institute, transplanted into the centre of its ordinary natural life. We may, in addition to this two-fold proof for the priority of the Thora from the post-Mosaic history, present the following considerations. Whence is it that the post-Mosaic history exhibits no trace of the developement of jurisprudence and legislation, observable in the history of other nations? How gradually did the Roman law develope itself, from its first indication in the Law of the Twelve Tables, (449 B. C.,) till it was codified in the time of the Cæsars! In the

history of Israel, on the contrary, there was in existence, from the time of the Judges, a system of law which regulated the conduct of men. The law did not first come into being in the course of the post-Mosaic history. It existed already, and yet, for centuries, as in the times of the Judges and Kings, it remained so inactive and devoid of influence, that it could not have existed as a custom or usage, it must have existed as a letter, a writing, which could be forgotten and thrown into a corner, and again brought forth and read, and assert its divine authority over Israel. This actually took place in the eighteenth year of Josiah, when Hilkiah, the priest, found the Book of the Law in the Temple; 2 K. 22; 2 Chron. 34.

If the Mosaic Law had not existed at the rending of the nation into two kingdoms, in immoveable and acknowledged authenticity, says Delitzsch, how entirely differently would the religious institutions of the northern kingdom have been regulated! And if it was not already in existence in a written form when the kingdom was divided, when was there a time in the post-Mosaic period when it could have come into being? It could have been written in the times of the Judges, as little as the New Testament could in the Middle Ages. The period of the Judges was a period of comparative barbarism, in which Israel was dispersed into different clanships, and there was a mixture in them of Israelites and heathen of the Canaanites. There was no renowned prophet; the priesthood lay in a depressed condition; and the men of acknowledged influence knew how to handle the sword, rather than to guide the pen. Delitzsch proceeds to show that the Book of the Law could not have had its origin in the times of Samuel, or of Saul, or of David and Solomon, or in the times of the rending of the kingdom, or of the Exile, or of *Ezra.* He was a Luther, who, when the mass of the people had fallen into a heathenish barbarism and religious ignorance, as a סוֹפֵר or Scribe, restored the written word of God to its former

valuation and honor. His agency was, throughout, only that of a restorer.

Thus the whole post-Mosaic history points back to the Sinaitic legislation, and a codex of the same. The Thora is the living and energetic word of God which pervades this history. The book of Genesis extends the farthest in its influence. The first chapter of Genesis contains the premises of the work of redemption, to which every atom of the world, and every pulse of its history, stands in causal relation.

But if the Thora already existed from the times of Moses as a written document, we would look for manifest traces of it in the literature as well as in the life of Israel. The sacred writers of the subsequent times would refer to it as a Mosaic writing, and would speak in expressions in which the Thora would be reëchoed. This Delitzsch illustrates, in the second place, by considering the *relation it bears to the post-Mosaic literature.* In this part of the argument he shows that its expressions are constantly repeated in the historic books, the Prophets and Psalms. That as Deuteronomy is the *δευτέρωσις*, or repetition of the Law, so the whole Old Testament is the repetition of Deuteronomy. All the history, prophecy, ethics, and poetry of Israel has its foundation and being in the Law of Moses. David is the great master of lyric song, and Isaiah of the prophetic word; but without Moses' Law, there would have been neither a David nor an Isaiah.

The Thora, or Law, is a book of *instruction*, which its name, Thora, (from יָרָה *to show, to teach,*) denotes. It has a unity of purpose, and a regular plan. In reference to the remaining books, it forms an independent and finished whole. The division into five books is no after-thought; it consisted of five books originally. It is a five-fold, and not, with the book of Joshua, a six-fold work. This is a supplemental writing, and no part of the original whole.

If we now inquire in reference to the book of Genesis, as to its position in this work of many parts, and its own internal plan, we discern, as to the first, that it contains the history preliminary to that which we are made acquainted with by the four remaining books. No more striking name can be thought of than the book of Genesis—βίβλος γενέσεως, the book of the generation, or origination—not of the world only—it describes not this alone—but the revelation of God as Jehovah, the redemption which was to come, the future Law, the future people of God, the future possession of the promised land. It points out to us the ancient divine or hallowed institutions, which the Law takes up and carries out; the beginnings of the Sabbath, of sacrifices, of the distinction between clean and unclean among animals, the prohibition of the eating of blood, the death penalty for the shedding of human blood, the rite of circumcision. In the organism of the Thora, or Law, it holds, throughout, a preparatory and introductory place. As to the disposition of its contents, these group themselves into five parts, holding forth the revelation of redemption in the history of Adam, (1–6 : 7 ;) of Noah, (6 : 8–11 : 25 ;) of Abraham, (11 : 26–25 : 18 ;) of Isaac, (25 : 19–35 : 29 ;) and Jacob, (ch. 36–50.)

If now we inquire whether the existence of such a work as the Thora is conceivable in the Mosaic period, we answer: 1. That all the preparatory conditions for such a work existed. The objection raised by Bohlen and Vatke, that the art of writing was unknown in the times of Moses, is removed by the fact that there are Egyptian papyri in the hieroglyphic and hieratic character, not only of the Mosaic, but of the ante-Mosaic period. Seyffarth, who has had in hand more than ten thousand Egyptian papyri, is a trustworthy authority, who affirms that at least two thousand years before Christ, and therefore in the patriarchal age, writing upon the papyrus existed. The night in which Israel came forth out of Egypt was the birth-hour of history.

The Egyptians lacked the true idea of a nation, and still more the idea of a God, the creator of heaven and earth. These two ideas call true historical writing into being. Israel came forth out of Egypt a united people, as no other on the earth ever was, and the God who led them, and whom they worshipped, was one God, the God of gods. 2. *The Thora answers all the expectations which we can entertain in relation to a writing of Moses in view of his personal character.* Moses belongs to those powerful minds in whom the ripe end of one historic period coincides with the creative beginning of another; in which a long past culminates, and a far reaching future has its root. He is the end of the patriarchal and the beginning of the legal dispensation. We expect, therefore, in him, as the sacred writer of history, a practical uniting of the present revelation with its patriarchal and primitive presumptions. He is as the mediator of the Law, a prophet, and, indeed, the greatest of all the prophets. We therefore expect from him unequalled prophetic disclosures, respecting the ways of God in the past and in the future. He is learned in all the wisdom of Egypt. A writing from his hand will betray manifold and intelligent allusions to Egyptian usages, laws, and facts; and the well educated man of Egypt, his native soil. And as it respects the form of such a work, we would expect from him an arrangement of the materials according to the unities of some great plan; negligence in the particulars of the recital, and yet a comprehensive and spirited aiming at the total effect and the most important matters, and depth and sublimity in union with the purest simplicity. We shall recognize in the lofty unity of purpose, the powerful leader and ruler of myriads of people; in the child-like *naïvete*, the shepherd of Midian, who, far from the various pursuits of Egypt, pastures the sheep of Jethro in the luxuriant wadys of Mount Sinai. The answer to both preliminary questions results favorably, so far, to the Mosaic origin. And yet, says this author, it would be too hasty, should we now, with-

out further research, decide that the writing of the entire Pentateuch, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, was done by Moses. Only so much, says he, stands firm thus far, as the result: first, that the Pentateuch must belong to the first period of Israelitish authorship; and also, in general, that the striking particulars touching the times and personality of Moses *can* have been written down by him, but not that they *were* written down by him. To be certain of this, we must first see what the Pentateuch says of itself. If it claims to be the work of Moses, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, we must so receive it; for, aside from the above considerations, we hold it as certainly impossible, that a work which became the creative foundation of the holy nation of Israel, and whose divine sanctity is raised above all doubt, should bear a false testimony respecting itself.

Delitzsch next proceeds to consider the internal testimony, as presented in Exod. 24: 4–7; 34: 27; 17: 14; and Numb. 33: 2; in which the book of the covenant is referred to, and Moses is directed to write the words of the covenant and the slaughter of the Amalekites in a book, and a register is given of the encampments of the children of Israel. He regards it as too wide a conclusion from these premises, that he wrote out the whole Pentateuch. He ventures no further than to determine this, that of the five books of the Law, Deuteronomy expressly sets up for itself the claim that it was composed by Moses, while the intermediate books claim for Moses only the writing of two series of laws and a list of encampments.

Delitzsch notes the fact, which, in our view, can be seen as well in the other five books, Genesis more especially, that Deuteronomy is rich in Egyptian allusions, which one would expect only of a book written by Moses' own hand, and on the confines of Egypt and Palestine. He notes the archaisms in expression contained in it, which mark it as of the same antiquity with the other books, while the love for figurative language, seen also in the Mosaic psalm, (the 90th

in the book of Psalms,) he recognizes as a characteristic of Moses. To this is to be united the internal argument of a psychological nature springing from the independence and sublimity of style with which the legislation is reproduced and carried out, the testamentary character throughout, and the unceasing transition of the language of Moses into the language of Jehovah, a phenomenon so decided and involuntary, that it can only be comprehended on the supposition that these discourses are the immediate effusion of the high self-consciousness of the mediator of the Law.

Delitzsch now proceeds to the inquiry, whether the admission of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy carries with it that of the other books. In respect to this, he claims that Deuteronomy bears a peculiar individual impress not elsewhere found; that while the other books of the Pentateuch are allied to it most intimately in spirit and form, there is still a difference not accounted for by the difference of the situation and materials of one and the same author.

In order to arrive at a judgment as to the authorship of the other books, which he acknowledges presuppose, and, indeed, contain, records of Mosaic origin, he recurs to the well-known observation that down to the section beginning with Exod. 6: 2, 7, (the preparation by Jehovah of Moses and Aaron as instruments for the deliverance of Israel,) the interchange of the divine name, Elohim, with Jehovah, characterizes the whole writing. In this portion, the use of the names of God enables us to designate sections of four classes: those in which the prevalent name of God is Elohim, those in which it is Jehovah, those in which the names are interchanged habitually, those in which no express name of God appears.

Delitzsch touches briefly on the derivation and signification of these names of God, but does not enter at length into the discussion their signification has called forth. We will endeavor to exhibit it more in detail. The

name אֱלֹהִים the plural of אֱלוֹהַּ which is found as the name of God only in the highly poetic style, is not derived from אֵל as either a participle from אוּל in the sense of *being strong*, nor as a primitive, which Gesenius, Thesaur. (1, p. 49) seems to intimate, nor from a verb, אָלַהּ, *to be strong*, which some wrongly suppose to be a form from the same root, as they would derive גַּבָּהּ from גָּבַב=גּוּב. It rather is a noun of the infinitive, from the root אָלַהּ, now lost from the Hebrew, but found in the Arabic *alaha*, *aliha*. This word bears, in the Kamoos, or great lexicon of Firuzabadi, the significations, to *wander about without aim, not knowing how to help one's self; to flee to one for refuge; to adore, or worship*, which is its prevailing transitive meaning. From this signification the Kamoos derives the name of God—*Alahu*. One of its conjugations has the meaning *to be stunned, or smitten with fear*. We may believe, therefore, that the idea of religious fear, which leads to the worship and adoration of Him who is the object of fear, lies at the foundation of this name of God. He is so called because He is the object of veneration and worship. We are aware that it has been objected to this exposition, that fear is the product of guilt and of sin, and is utterly inconsistent with the genuine spirit of devotion. But we can not forget, in this connexion, that the common designation of pious men in the Hebrew Scriptures is יִרְאֵי אֱלֹהִים *fearers of God*, and that the wicked are characterized as those who cast off this fear. He himself is called פַּחַד and מוֹרָא *fear* (Gen. 31: 42, 53; Ps. 76: 12; Is. 8: 12, *et seq.* Comp. 2 Thess. 2: 4.) the Fear, *e. g.*, of Isaac, *i. e.*, the one inspiring fear, whom Isaac venerated and adored. Far more satisfactory is this derivation, in our esteem, than that which makes it from אָלָה in the sense to swear, either as indicating, as Cocceius thinks, Him whose prerogative it is to pronounce a curse, and so to bind the conscience by His commination as a judge, or, as has appeared to others, as representing the Trinity engaged

in an eternal covenant which was ratified betwixt them by a solemn oath. This is, indeed, a striking and beautiful thought. But the former explanation, that the Creator is called Elohim, as being the object of reverence and adoration, is much nearer the primitive meaning of the word. There must be the realization of a being to be feared and worshipped, and to whom we are responsible, before there can be an oath taken. And then the form of the verb to *swear*, is in the Arabic *aliya*, indicating a different root, a distinction preserved in the Hebrew also.

That this name assumes a plural form, while the words standing in grammatical relation to it are usually singular, has attracted much attention. Some have connected with it the expressions, "Let us make man," or, as Delitzsch translates it, "We will make man in our image, and according to our likeness": Gen. 1: 26. The various theories respecting this plural name of God are: 1. That it is a simple plural of majesty. This is a common explanation among the Rabbins, some of whom took a low view of its use, as being merely for the purpose of bestowing honor upon God; and others, as indicating that He embraced all lordships and dominions within Himself. 2. A second view is of more modern origin, that the plural originated in polytheism, which it is assumed was the earliest form of religion, from which monotheism was gradually developed—a view advocated by LeClerc, Herder, deWette, and others, but contrary to all history as revealed in the Scriptures. Monotheism was the first religion man had upon the earth. It was when his foolish heart was darkened, that he changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. 3. That it is a plural, such as is used in abstract nouns, to express the quintessence of the separate individuals in which the quality is found, or, in individual names, to denote that the individual concenters in himself the sum of all that quality or assembly of qualities the

name suggests. 4. That it is a numerical plural, including the angels as well as God; that it refers to God as far forth as he reveals Himself and works through a multitude of spiritual beings. 5. That it is founded on the doctrine of a trinity in the Godhead, the view taken by Peter Lombard, and current among our orthodox divines, though rejected by Calvin as *parum solida.* He seems to have been satisfied with the third view mentioned above. Sufficient for me, says he, is it that the plural number suggests those powers (*virtutes*) of God which He put forth in creating the world.

Delitzsch says the plural Elohim is not an abstract noun denoting Divinity. In the mouth of the heathen it is numerical, though then not without exception; comp. Exod. 32: 4, where it is intensive. It is, as Schelling, after Storr, has quite correctly remarked, *pluralis magnitudinis.* The idea of the majestic is, so to say, inwardly magnified to imply the highest capacity for the same. Comp. Kedhoshim, Prov. 9: 10; Hos. 12: 1. Thus the name Elohim denotes God as the one infinitely great, the transcendent, the absolute; but it designates Him according to its derivation, not as subject, but only as object; and, moreover, the plural represents the oneness of the person in the background, leaving in front the plenitude or wealth which it indicates. This is true as well of Elohim without the article, which, when used of the true God, is a proper name, as of the appellation Ha-Elohim, in which the article does not make the personality, but the unity of God prominent. The multiplicity of the one God, which Elohim, as the name of God, expresses, is wholly within God. One, adds he, can not say without obliterating the distinction between the two Testaments, that Elohim is the plural of the trinity, but may say perfectly correctly that the *trinity* is the plurality which Elohim denotes, now disclosed in the New Testament. That is, if we correctly understand what Delitzsch would say, he holds that, while the doctrine of the trinity is not expressly taught in the Old Testament,

but its full declaration was reserved for the New, it is, nevertheless, implied in this plural name of God, which does not simply mean that there is a plenitude of wealth in the Divine Being, but also the plurality in His nature which the doctrine of the trinity implies.

On the name Jehovah, derived from the future, and either to be pronounced יַהֲוֶה or יַהֲוָה *Jahaveh*, or *Jahavah*, (in the Masoretic text, always with the points of אֲדֹנָי or אֱלֹהִים *Adonay*, or *Elohim*, but by us, wherever it occurs, printed יַהֲוָה according to its proper pronunciation,) is the idea of personality already stamped, because it is originally a proper name; but Elohim, from Ha-Elohim, the Adorable, became so by usage. According to its signification, Jehovah is more than the personal God. For the divine declaration, *I am that I am*, אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה *I will be what I will be*, Exod. 3: 14, in which the name Jehovah is explained, proves not merely this, that God determines wholly from within Himself, and so is wholly and altogether a free personality, but, since the idea of the verb הָוָה or הָיָה φῦναι, *fieri*, is not that of continuing, but rather of active existence, that is, of becoming; it points to the future, and teaches that He, in a way corresponding identically with Himself, that is, with His own independent will, controls and will control all history. In spite of Hengstenberg and Hölemann, Delitzsch was always of the opinion that Jehovah indicates not so much He who *becomes*—that is, we suppose, becomes what He was not, and so undergoes change—but He that is; not the one whose being, but the revelation of whose being, is taking place. (*Existens* = ὁ ἐρχόμενος, as the Apocalypse explains it.) It designates God as He who ever puts Himself forth anew, in a way cognizable by man, who, through all the Æons, (ages,) reveals Himself, and is, in short, the God of historic revelation. One can not venture to distinguish the one name as designating God as super-mundane, and the other

as indicating Him as mundane, for Elohim is mundane, [*i. e.* in the Kosmos,] as the present and acting power over all creatures; but Jehovah is God, as the framer and disposer of history in the entire limits of the creation. Strikingly does Baumgarten remark, that Elohim is the God of the beginning and of the end, and Jehovah designates the God of the middle, that is, He also, from the beginning to the end, animates and developes all. The kingdom of power will become the kingdom of glory. Between lies the kingdom of grace, a long history, whose real substance is redemption. Jehovah is the God of the beginning and the end, acting as mediator through the course of this history—in one word, is God the Redeemer.

The name Jehovah is rightly made by Delitzsch from the future. It is not, as Grotius, and lately Ewald, (after the modern Jews,) have maintained, compounded of the future יִהְיֶה, the participle הֹוֶה, and the præter הָיָה. For the pronunciation, Jehovah, in the Masoretic text, represents not its own vowels, but those of Adonay, which the Jews, since the captivity, in their reading, have substituted for it. Nor does the passage—Apoc. 7: 8—evidently founded on this name of God, ὁ ὢν ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *which is, and which was, and which is to come*—establish this tripartite derivation. It is all included in the sense of the future, which, with peculiar emphasis, expresses duration without any bounds, to which is to be added the idea of the sufficiency of God within Himself, and His immutability, and faithfulness to His own promises. Jehovah is strictly a proper name. It has no other form, no construct or suffix state, and no plural. Elohim is sometimes used of creatures, but this never. It is the incommunicable name of a personal God, and while it marks Him as self-existent, all-sufficient, and immutable, it especially indicates Him as a God of grace and truth, standing in covenant relations to His people. How natural, in different states of mind, to pass from one name of God to the other, to

pronounce His name Elohim when viewed as the almighty Creator, to be adored and worshipped, to pronounce or write it Jehovah, when His covenant relations to His creatures are present to the view, and He is regarded as their Saviour. Beautifully expressive, often, is this interchange of the Divine names, coming, as it does, without warning to the reader.

How striking, says Delitzsch, does this stand in the section—Gen. 2: 4–24—in which the world, created by Elohim, passes over into a history of redemption, which has man for its central and final point, and which testifies that God the Creator, and God the Redeemer, is the Ruler of history, is Jahavah Elohim, יַהְוָה אֱלֹהִים throughout. And who would mistake it as unintentional, that Noah should call the Elohim who should enlarge Japhet, Jehovah, the God of Shem, and that Abraham more accurately designates the God whom Melchisedek names God Most High, אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, as Jahavah God Most High, יַהְוָה אֵל עֶלְיוֹן. Such evidently designed cases prove much. Why, again, is it, that in the entire sections Gen. 6 : 9–23; 9: 1–17; 20 : 1–17, the name Jehovah is never used? It can not be blind chance which here prevails. And yet the author, while he honored and loved both names as holy and deeply expressive, evidently took a pleasure in adorning his work with both alternately, being influenced sometimes by reasons of which he was conscious, sometimes by an unconscious or even an æsthetic preference. So the Psalter divides itself into Elohim Psalms, in which Elohim is the predominant, but not exclusive name of God, (Psalms 42 to 48,) and Jehovah Psalms, in which this name, in like manner, is prevalent. Asaph's are Elohim Psalms. Those of David and the Korahites are of a mixed character. Delitzsch considers the reasons which Henstenberg has assigned for the occurrence of these names, but comes to the conclusion that they are not always satisfactory, but that in the Psalms, as in the Pentateuch, the custom prevailed of

adorning the style with both these significant names of God. Both were dear to the writer, and he honors God in the use of both, to the neglect of neither. Signal instances of this alternate use are Gen. 7 : 15; "They went in [to the Ark] as Elohim commanded him, and Jehovah shut him in"; 27 : 27, 28. "The smell of a field which Jehovah hath blessed, therefore may Elohim give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth"; Exod. 3 : 4. "And when Jehovah saw that He turned aside to see, Elohim called unto Him out of the midst of the bush."

Delitzsch next discusses the passage—Exod. 6 : 2, *et seq.*—"I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name El-Shaddai, God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." He agrees that this passage does not prove that the name of Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs, and was first revealed to Moses, but only that God had not made known to the patriarchs all the extent of its signification as He had revealed it to Moses. It is peculiar to the Scriptures to let the incomplete stages lose themselves and vanish in the light of the more complete, so that there is only the semblance of an absolute distinction apparent. When, for instance, it is said, in John 1 : 17, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια, came by Jesus Christ," we must not deny to the Old Testament *all* acquaintance with grace and truth. Yet are חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת grace and truth the stars of the Old Testament heavens, but starlight does not amount to the light of the rising sun. But though the name Jehovah was not unknown, it was more rarely used; and there is a probability, he says, that from Gen. 1 to Exod. 6, two different species of historical writing are before us, of which the one renders prominent the peculiar present of the patriarchal knowledge of God, the other, the dawning future of the same, of which the one lies nearer to the form of contemporaneous history, the other to the contents of future history. He then main-

tains that there are favorite forms of expression peculiar to the Elohistic sections, and others to the Jehovistic, and gives forth his theory for the composition of the Pentateuch thus: That the kernel, or central part, of the same is the covenant roll, (Exod. 19–26,) written down by Moses himself, and wrought out in the historical order of the legislation. The remaining laws of the wilderness of Sinai, down to that of the plains of Moab, Moses announced orally, but they were written down by the priests, in whose calling this duty lay. As Deuteronomy does not suppose the written state of the entire ancient legislation, and still more, as it recapitulates the law with great freedom, we need not suppose that the entire codification had already taken place. Upon the soil of the Holy Land they began to write the history of Israel, which now reached a full period. The historiography of the Mosaic times, then necessitated of itself the record of the Mosaic legislation. Such a man as Eleazar the priest, the son of Aaron, (see respecting him, particularly, Numb. 26 : 1; 31 : 21,) may have written the large work beginning with בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא "In the beginning God created," etc., in which he incorporated the roll of the covenant, and the last words of Moses, (only more briefly,) because Moses had written them down with his own hand. A second historian, like Joshua, (see Deut. 32 : 44; Josh. 24 : 26; comp. 1 Sam. 10 : 22,) who is a prophet, and speaks as a prophet, or one of the זְקֵנִים elders, upon whom the spirit of Moses rested, (Numb. 11 : 25,) and many of whom survived Joshua, (Josh. 24 : 31,) completed the work—not certainly by the prompting of his own will, or from the dictate of his own nature—but by the authorization of some one else, and incorporated in it the whole of Deuteronomy, the spirit of which had moulded that of the compiler himself. So, perhaps, arose the Thora, not without advantage being taken of other written documents by both narrators. Exod. 11 : 3, and Numb. 12 : 3, in which Moses

is renowned as being very great in the land of Egypt, and as being meek above all the men upon the face of the earth, and Deut. 34 : 10, compared with Numb. 12 : 8, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face," we must ascribe to the Jehovist, his disciple, and perhaps his friend. Both of them, the priestly Elohist and the prophetical Jehovist, are, each in his own way, but the echo and the copy of the great Lawgiver, their teacher and prototype. As after the ascension of Jesus, the evangelists wrote His Gospel in His Spirit, so did these two, after the removal of Moses, write his Law and the history that contains it. The note-worthy passage—Ezra 9 : 10–12—where a commandment of the Thora, given during the wandering in the wilderness, is cited as the word of the servants of Jehovah, the prophets, is due to the consciousness that the Thora had been written in this way.

We have now followed our author till we have reached his view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch, and of Genesis as a part of it. To enable us to understand the relation which his theory bears to the others which have from time to time been adopted, it may be useful to give, somewhat after his own manner, the history of the various opinions which have been ventilated by ingenious, but not always reverential scholars, as to the same point. We find Vitringa, in his *Observationes Sacræ*, chap. 4, pp. 3–6, *et seq.*, offering his own conjectures as to the origin particularly of the first book, Genesis. He supposes that the first Fathers of the Church held frequent assemblies long before the Mosaic age, in which they frequently and mutually discoursed concerning the origin of the world, the fall of man, the promise of grace, which was often repeated, and the revelations made to themselves or their ancestors, and that this was necessary for the strengthening of their faith, the sustaining of their hope, and the conviction of those ungodly Cainites by whom they were surrounded; and that these

men wrote down, for the use of their children after them, those truths made known to them by divine revelation, or the testimony of others. This was specially done as the human race multiplied, and faith in the divine promises was threatened and tried by the increasing wickedness of the race. Those parchments and portfolios (*scrinia*) of the Fathers, he supposes Moses to have collated, digested, set in order, and supplemented, and from them to have composed the book of Genesis. If Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or even antediluvian patriarchs, left any fragments of Scripture, they were equally inspired with other holy men of old, but of a later date, who were moved by the Holy Ghost. Moses also enjoyed the Spirit's aid while perfecting this work, no less than Luke, who composed his Gospel from the narratives and annotations of those who from the begining were *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου*, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. This harmless hypothesis, as propounded by Vitringa, was set forth by others in a different vein. In 1753 appeared, at Brussels, a treatise from the pen of Astruc, entitled, Conjectures respecting the Original Memoirs which it appears Moses used in composing Genesis,* in which he sought to show, from the interchange of the names of God, that Moses compiled the book of Genesis from two principal documents, availing himself also of ten others. This hypothesis, which is called *the Document Hypothesis*, was advocated by Eichorn and Herder, and was modified and perfected by Ilgen and Gramberg. By the side of this was introduced, first by Vater, the *Fragment Hypothesis*, which regards the Pentateuch as a mosaic, composed of fragments of various authors. Both these attempts to account for the origin of the Pentateuch, Delitzsch says, have had their day. The mechanical method they contemplate is inconsistent with that living unity which these

* Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux, dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de Genèse.

writings exhibit. In the place of both these, the *Supplementary Hypothesis* is now the prevailing one among the critics of the German school, according to which, the author of the Pentateuch, the Jehovist, had before him an older account—that of the Elohist—extending from the creation to the death of Joshua, and wrought it over and enlarged it. This hypothesis is, after the precedent labors upon it of De Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Von Bohlen and Stähelin, carried out, with the most subtle and careful thoroughness, by Tuch, in his Commentary on Genesis. There is no better name for the hypothesis advocated by Ewald in his History of the People of Israel, than the *Crystallization Hypothesis.* He divides the Pentateuch in four non-contemporaneous parts, which have received their last form from the author of Deuteronomy, who is, also, the last author of the book of Joshua, which belongs likewise to the Pentateuch. Of these, the book of the Covenant is the oldest portion, and was written in the times of Sampson. The next is the *Liber Originum*, תּוֹלְדוֹת to which are assigned the chief portion of the Elohistic fragments, a work throughout of a religio-historical and legislative object, written by a Levite of the last third of Solomon's reign. There is further to be distinguished a first prophetic narrator of the primitive history, a citizen of the kingdom of Israel in the age of Elijah and Joel, and a second prophetic narrator of the times between 800 and 750 B. C., who, like the author of the book of the Covenant, calls God by the name Jehovah, rarely by the name Elohim. He had the works of the three others before him, and is the author of the Pentateuch and Joshua in their present form. Kurtz represents Ewald as pointing out no less than ten different writers, including these four, as being concerned in the production of the Pentateuch, and sarcastically remarks that "Ewald is able not only to assign to each of these ten authors his own part in the great work, even to single verses and words, but generally, also, to distinguish and to characterize the sources

from which each of them had, again, drawn his original materials!"* Such is the wonderful sagacity or effrontery of modern unbelieving criticism.

There remains the one theory which the Church, both Jewish and Christian, have held for ages, that the Pentateuch has but one real author, and that author, Moses, which belief is not impugned by the few additions by a later hand, the most obvious of which is the last chapter of Deuteronomy. The usual arguments for this are: 1. The regular plan and unity of purpose displayed in the entire five-fold book, pointing, it is believed, to one author. This unity and regular progressive plan Delitzsch admits and pleads for, and strives to represent as consistent with his theory. But it is far more consistent with the ordinary belief.

2. The fact that the book is the basis of all Jewish history, civil and ecclesiastical, and, so far as history goes, the beginning of its literature; that it exhibits throughout, manifold traces of the Mosaic age, and evidently belongs to that period. This, too, is argued by Delitzsch, and in this respect his modification of the *supplemental hypothesis* is not open to the objections of others who have advocated it, and who have located its composition at various points in the post-Mosaic centuries.

3. A third argument has been adduced from the passages in the Pentateuch itself in which Moses is represented as having written the Law and delivered it unto the priests, and ordered them to deposite it in the side, or by the side, of the Ark. In the book, too, he was directed to write the conflict with the Amalekites. He is said to have written all the words of the Lord; to have taken the book and read in the audience of the people; to have written in the book the journeyings of the children of Israel. The book of the Law is referred to, and throughout the sacred writings is called *the Law of Moses.* Not conclusive is the protest of

* Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Cov't, 1, p. 61.—Note.

Delitzsch, that the Pentateuch could be called the Law of Moses, with far greater right than the Book of Psalms could be called the Psalms of David, without being in all its parts immediately Mosaic. The Pentateuch is one continuous book, with a regular plan; the Psalms are a collection of detached compositions, probably receiving increment from time to time. The earliest portion of the collection consisted of the Psalms of David, and these gave the style or title of the whole when referred to in popular speech. The same reason could not be given for the ascription of the Pentateuch to Moses. We are persuaded that the common reader would take these expressions to point out Moses as the author of the book, and that there is far more reason for affirming it than for maintaining that Julius Cæsar wrote the Gallic War, in which the same indirect way of speaking of himself occurs.

But the entire argument for the genuineness of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses is cumulative, embracing a multiplicity of details. These may be found fully handled in the apologetic writings of Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Drechsler, Ranke, Welte, and Kurtz, but can not be brought forward by us now, after these protracted remarks.

In reference to the peculiar theory of Delitzsch, that the Pentateuch was written partly by the hand of Moses, and the rest by two like-minded men, one of the priestly, the other more of the prophetic order, which subsequently arose, we see no advantage it has over the opinion that Moses either wrote the whole himself, or was assisted in some portions by others, over whom he exercised his superintendence. So that he was, under the divine inspiration, the human author, the Holy Spirit being the Divine Author of the book. This does not exclude the hypothesis that there may have been writings of the patriarchal age, authentic and inspired, which Moses used in the primeval history that preceded his own times. The difference of phraseology, which has been presented as characterizing the

Elohistic, as compared with the Jehovistic portions, may thus be accounted for as to the book of Genesis; and for this difference, so far as it appears in the four remaining books, the consideration that an author's own style as to favorite expressions alters with the circumstances and times in which he writes, may furnish a sufficient solution. He who has heard the same speaker, or read the productions of the same living writer, through the lapse of years, must have observed this fact. The same thing occurs in the writings of Paul, Peter, and John, in the New Testament, and has given rise to various theories of a different author, among the critics of Germany, of books and portions of books through all past ages ascribed to them.

Numbers 12: 3, which speaks of Moses as meek above all the men upon the face of the earth, and other similar passages where the Jewish Lawgiver is mentioned in terms of praise, admit of several explanations well known to scholars, more probable than the theory of Delitzsch, and which neither require nor justify his view as to their author. The last chapter in Deuteronomy, which speaks of the death of Moses, and a few other expressions, could have proceeded from a later, but authorized hand. Much more accordant is this view with the traditionary opinion, which certainly goes back beyond the New Testament times, for Christ and the apostles acknowledged the Law not only as given, but written, by Moses. "Had ye believed Moses," says our Saviour, "ye would have believed me, for he *wrote* of me. But if you believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe my words."

Delitzsch's view does, indeed, place the last writer of the Pentateuch in the age next succeeding Moses, making him contemporary with Joshua, and, probably, through a part of his life, contemporary with Moses himself, and in this respect is not to be confounded with that of De Wette, who locates the Elohist in the time of Samuel or Saul, 1120 or 1050

B. C., or 400 years after Moses, and the Jehovist in the time of Solomon, 1015–975, B. C.

And yet, while Delitzsch speaks nobly and truly in defence of the Pentateuch, and especially against the charge that it repeats itself without reason, we are sorry that he should have said that inspiration does not altogether exclude unconscious historical errors. If it does not, then the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures must be given up. But, in our view, the Holy Spirit never left these holy men whom He moved to write, at any moment when thus employed on these documents of our faith. However freely their minds may have moved, and however each one may have shown forth the mental peculiarities which distinguished each, He never withdrew His influence till the record was completely finished. This record, therefore, must have been infallible truth, as it flowed from the pen of him who was moved by the Holy Ghost.

Yet, with much force does Delitzsch charge upon the modern criticism of his own times and country, that it is unfree, *i. e.*, that it is a bond-slave. For when innumerable external and internal reasons make the Mosaic origin of the Thora evident, it must hold its contents as a web of intermingled history and myth, of times not contemporaneous. For it is held bound, by its dogmatic prejudices, to maintain that there is no preternatural revelation, no miraculous agency of God in nature and human life, no prophecy proceeding from inspiration. Modern criticism is driven to the three following foregone conclusions: 1. The Pentateuch represents itself as the history of a supernatural divine revelation, of an actual commerce of God with our first parents, with the patriarchs, with Israel. Therefore, it is neither strictly historical nor Mosaic. DeWette can not allow the causes and consequences of events, as related in the Pentateuch, to be true; and thus the Pentateuch is regarded by him as the theocratic epos of the Hebrews, and the Jehovah of the Pentateuch, so far as He steps forth

acting in history, is to him the product of legend—in the same category with the Homeric gods. So Ewald designates the fact, that the Godhead appears acting and visible in history, as the peculiarity of the Hebrew Mythus. It avails nothing to deny, says he, that the Hebrew tradition approaches the heathen mythology in this. With such presumptions to the contrary, it is impossible to hold to the historicalness and contemporaneousness of the Thora, were both ever so well attested. 2. The second is of the following import: the Pentateuch is full of miraculous occurrences, which, as DeWette expresses it, are beyond the thought of the thinking mind, at least are doubtful, and so it is and must be post-Mosaic, for its stories of miracles are an ideal poetic robe, which was first thrown around the genuine historical tradition at a date subsequent to the events. 3. The Pentateuch contains prophetic discourses, which bespeak a knowledge of the events of times subsequent to Moses. Such a knowledge is not conceivable. These prophecies are, therefore, *vaticinia post eventum*—prophecies after the event—or they at least came into existence in those times when these events could be surely foreseen. De Wette characterizes the prophecies of the Pentateuch as invented, with the remark, "Such prophecies have the Indian Puranas put into the mouth of their old heroes." From this predetermined denial of all true prophecy, there results a peculiar procedure for determining the date of the composition of the Pentateuch. The *vaticinia post eventum* serve as marks for determining the date. Because, according to the Elohist, it was promised the patriarchs that kings should descend from them, the Elohist could not have written before the elevation of Saul to the throne of Israel. Because Isaac announces to Esau his independence of Jacob, and Balaam predicts the subjugation of Amalek, Edom, and Moab, the Jehovist could not have written till after the victory of Saul over the Amalekites, and David over the Moabites and Edom-

ites. But Isaac speaks—27 : 40—of the attempt of Edom to free himself from the yoke of Israel, which removes the time of the Jehovist to the reign of Solomon, towards the end of which Edom rose in revolt. This procedure, which turns the head of prophecy, looking to the future, backwards, is one of Ewald's sources of proof. The oldest portion of the Pentateuch is, according to Ewald, the so-called Book of the Covenant. The author lived in the times of Sampson. How does Ewald know this? Because—Gen. 49 : 17, "Dan shall be a serpent by the way"—he refers to the times of the Danite, Sampson, as a *vaticinium post eventum.* To the fourth narrator (of his theory) is ascribed the assumed prophecy of Balaam, in which is predicted the coming of ships from the coast of Chittim, and the affliction of Asshur. This, also, is a *vaticinium post eventum,* and the fourth narrator wrote near the time of the victory of the Tyrian king Eluläos over the piratical fleet of the Phenician Cypriots. Menander, compared with Josephus, must determine the time in which the fourth supplementer lived, which, in addition, will be settled by the prophetic words of Isaac concerning Esau—chap. 27 : 39. Is this criticism, asks Delitzsch, not forced, and devoid of all true freedom and independence? True criticism presupposes the Pentateuch neither as Mosaic nor post-Mosaic, but decides from external and internal grounds. But this criticism is forced to hold it as post-Mosaic, in spite of all external and internal arguments, because it contains words and theophanies of God, miracles and prophecies; and yet, in the Mosaic times, all must have gone on quite naturally as now! But every thing of this present day moves, according to the laws of nature, only to those who have never heard that God speak within them, who gave His fiery Law on Sinai, who have no realization that they have been translated from the kingdom of nature into that of the Spirit, and have tasted the powers of the world to come, to whom the eye of faith is not yet

opened to see the majesty of God revealing itself marvellously, ever and anon. The possibility of miracle and prophecy is agreeable to the experience of the believer; and the miracle of the new birth, and the Spirit's influences, are his security for the same. For this reason, he stands free in reference to the miracles and prophecies of Scripture, without being forced credulously to admit them, or incredulously to deny them beforehand. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. There also is true and unslavish criticism; a criticism which neither is doomed to affirm *a priori*, nor *a priori* to deny, but is placed in a position to form an unbiassed judgment, as the state of facts, in the present or past, may demand.

Thus we approach, says Delitzsch, the historical contents of Genesis with confidence. The following two considerations will strengthen us against the mistrust of unbelief. This history of the primitive times, which Genesis gives, *can* be authentic. The source whence it is borrowed is the oral tradition, transmitted in the family of the patriarchs, by which, according to the divine command—Gen. 18: 19—the remembrance of the divine revelations was handed down during the lifetime of the Fathers, which could be the more easily done, the longer their lives, the more simple their mode of living, and more secluded from foreign influences they were. Over this tradition they certainly watched with the greatest care. It was to the chosen race the foundation of its existence, the bond of its union, the mirror of its duties, the security of its future, and so its most precious inheritance. The credibility of the historical contents of Genesis might, with certainty, be expected. For, as the true religion, the religion of redemption, declared in the Scriptures, rests upon the facts of revelation, it is by the true tradition of these that its own security is effected; and to this end religious feeling and a regard for historical truth converge. Not only the universally conceded character of the people of Israel, but the

work and testimony of Christ, as given in the New Testament, presuppose, and so establish, the truth of the historical contents of Genesis, and of the history of the Old Testament. Should we compare the Old Testament literature with that of the pagan East, it has not its like in sobriety, in child-like objectivity, in pure morality, in its universal aspect, and its interest in mankind at large. One will thus acknowledge the prevalence here of another power than that power of nature heathenism exhibits. The literature of Israel is a miracle of grace. It is the literature of redemption from the jurisdiction of the principle of nature; the literature of the spirit which has laid hold again on God as that power which is above nature; the literature of the regeneration of the old heathen East by the grace of the one everlasting God. It is, for this reason, not so gorgeous to the senses, not so dazzling in speculation, not so imposing in the eyes of men, as, for example, the literature of India. The Orient, in the Old Testament literature, has become a child, that it may enter into the kingdom of God. There rests upon it a tranquil peace, whose rainbow arches over the deepest excitement. It has found every thing in the one personal God, who is in history and over history, its safe measure and its firm boundary. As Hellenism brought back, at a later period, the gigantic, and, in great part, distorted forms of the East, to the measure of human beauty, thus, in Israel, divine truth lifts itself out of the chaos of the mythic, fantastic nature-life of the Orient, quiet and chaste, without noise and pomp.

These things are beautifully and nobly said.

We have thus given our readers an outline of the introduction to this commentary on Genesis. To a very large extent, and far beyond what we at first purposed, we have allowed the author to present his own views, merely exchanging the German for an English dress. It was our purpose to have commented upon the expository part of the

work, especially his explanation of the cosmogony contained in the first chapter, which, he says, lies not outside, but within the orbit of the history of salvation, which begins its course from eternity, and circles back to eternity again. For God had, in creating the world, the earth for His aim; and on the earth, man; and among men, Israel; and in this redeemed nation, His redeemed Church; and in the Church of the redeemed, the consummation of all created things. These words are refreshing, and though there are defects in the treatment, and views from which we must express our dissent, and there are illustrations from the traditions of other nations, perhaps more than is meet, and a less elaborate and ample handling of the latter part of the book, where the foundations of the Church are represented as laid in the institutions of the patriarchal age, there is much in this volume to commend, and much that places it far beyond those cold and unevangelic commentaries which have proceeded from the German school in this our age.

ARTICLE II.

SUPERIORITY OF THE GREEKS IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS.

The superiority of the ancient Greeks in literature and the fine arts, has often been a theme of wonder and admiration; and many causes have been proposed to account for so striking a phenomenon. There is one, however, which has not received the notice it deserves, to which we desire briefly to call attention. We mean the intense spirit of emulation, the panting desire to excel, which distinguished that people beyond those of any other age or coun-

try. The origin of this passion, it is not our purpose to trace, or to investigate the causes which made the bosoms of the ancient Greeks burn with such an intense enthusiasm of competition, such an absorbing spirit of rivalry, in every pursuit. Certain it is, that for more than a century, this was the very soul of Greece; and Plato said that the national spirit of the Lacedemonians, the passion for victory, was rooted in their breasts; all their habits tended to inflame it. Cicero says that Greece always claimed the palm of victory, though they were fonder of contention than of truth; Horace remarks that the Greeks, animated alone by ambition, have excelled in letters; and the Athenian historian, Thucydides, tells us they aimed at a *perpetual possession*, and not at mere temporary success. The great Athenian orator expressed the feelings of every one of his countrymen, when he said that Athens had wasted more blood and treasure merely to stand foremost and take the lead in Greece, than other nations had expended to defend their dearest rights.

Almost at the dawn of existence, even in the days of childhood, in his sports and amusements, to excel his companions was the principle inculcated into the mind of every Greek. And as they advanced in life, emulation entered into every thing in which they engaged, and became the ruling principle of their souls.

In the education of their youth, there was no retired study, no isolated, independent effort; their minds were formed by an incessant struggle with each other, and not cast in one regular mould. As they strove with the grasp of desperation in the palæstra, so mind was perpetually grasping with mind; ever active, contention and dispute were their delight; mental superiority their only object of ambition; *præter laudem nullius avari*, greedy of nothing but praise.

This emulation to excel was cherished and exalted into a religious principle by the public games, and especially by

those of Olympia, which exerted an influence unparalleled in any other country. Here the mightiest energies, both of mind and body, were called forth. Here the combatants were to contend, not before the people of their own town or village, but the immense population of Greece, assembled in one vast concourse to witness their victory or defeat. No wonder that parents expired in the arms of their sons with joy, as they saw them crowned with the wreath of victory. No wonder that the desire to excel, thus cherished, infused an almost superhuman energy into the genius of Greece. Says Kitto: "These games, taken in connexion with the early training by which they were preceded, and of which they were the natural result and reward, were a *grand educational system*, bearing primarily, indeed, in favor of the physical developement, but also tending directly and powerfully to advance the highest intellectual and moral culture. The exercises through which the child, the youth, and the man, were stage by stage conducted, each in sucession, becoming more difficult and complex, as the bodily powers came into play and acquired vigor, were admirably adapted to give that union of strength and beauty in which physical perfection consists, and in which the Greek nations probably surpassed every other known people. But the vigor and energy which ensued imply health and hilarity: hence arise humane, kind, and generous dispositions; so that a good state of the body, promoting moral soundness, combined with bodily vigor, guaranteed intellectual activity and mental power. The existence of these exercises and these games in each separate state, secured the developement and activity of those feelings which made his own country to each one most dear and venerable; while a narrow and selfish patriotism was greatly prevented, and emotions which embraced the whole Hellenic race were enkindled and fostered by those general meetings, which from time to time called together, especially at Olympia, all who were not alien from the Greek

commonwealth, marked out by the use of that noble instrument of speech, the Greek tongue."

Frederick Schlegel remarks: "The gymnastic struggles—the peculiar object of the public games, and where the human frame attained a beautiful form and expansion, by every species of exercise—the gymnastic struggles had a very close connexion with, and may be said to have formed the basis for the imitative arts, especially sculpture, which, without that habitual contemplation of the most exquisite forms afforded by these games, could never have acquired so bold, free, and animated a representation of the human body."

Nor was this all; this energy of genius, if brought into action in other circumstances, might have been wild and extravagant; but the peculiar circumstances of Greece called it forth in the strictest conformity with the dictates of nature and a refined taste.

One of these circumstances was the form of their government, which, while it opened a boundless field for competition, gave a native business cast to all their mental efforts. Emphatically the government of the people, by whom all measures were decided, that "fierce democratie," as Milton calls it, had but little of the security and firmness of the constitutional states of modern times. In addition to this, the rich and the poor, jealous of each other, were constantly endeavoring to gain the ascendency. "The governments of Greece," says one, "so far as the arts were concerned, operated most powerfully. Hence statues, paintings, etc., were for the people; and it is well known that the plaudits of an enraptured multitude are much more intoxicating than those of an autocrat. Again, specimens of art in Greece were for the public places, where they constantly met the public gaze; *e. g.*, Minerva of the Parthenon, which would not only spread the reputation of Phidas through Athens, but was the object of adoration to thousands of strangers who thronged the city; and his Jupiter at

Olympia was visited quadrennially by thousands, who came from the four quarters of the world to the Olympic festival. In Greece, too, unity of people was linked with the arts. Their tombs, temples, altars, and consecrated places, their shields, helmets, breast-plates, etc., were all made by the artists' skill to perpetuate the memory of their fathers."

Thus a spirit of competition acted on the minds of the Greeks in every period and condition of life.

As to their most important interests, they were a nation of men brought into an incessant contest of intellect and feelings. In respect to poetry and the fine arts, this passion to excel was developed under circumstances the most favorable that we can imagine; not in a country exposed to the withering influences of a torrid clime; not where the eye rested on arid plains and joyless deserts, tending only to enervate the mind, and blunt the edge of genius; not under the cold and inclement skies of the north, where they saw nothing but snow and ice, or were enveloped in mist and fog, chilling the finer feelings of the soul and blasting the buddings of genius; but in a country whose broken surface, ever varied in beauty, was clad with the eternal verdure of spring; with a climate more soft and delicious than any other on the globe; with a sky of the purest azure, and of so intense clearness that by his silent gaze the Greek seemed to penetrate the very heavens. The noblest scenery of our earth was spread out around him. He looked upon the bold and lofty steeps of Olympus, whose summits were bathed in the blue vault of heaven; he trod the vale of Tempe, plucked flowers on the banks of the Ilissus, and drank from the fountains of Castalia and Helicon. From the Acropolis at Athens, he looked towards the Ægean sea, studded with its hundred isles; on the one hand were the plains of Platæa and Marathon, and on the other, the Straits of Salamis, the scenes of his country's glory, and associated with the holiest recollections. Every thing around him and within him urged him on to tread the path of glory and

excellence. Under such circumstances, the effusions of the poet came forth from a glowing imagination, imbued with the noblest spirit—a spirit which still lives and breathes, in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," and renders them immortal.

Says Professor Wines: "Literature, philosophy, and the fine arts spread rapidly over Greece, and were cultivated with an ardor unknown in any other age or country. There did the Greek, possessing the finest genius, and blessed with the most delicious climate and picturesque scenery, produce those immortal works in poetry, eloquence, history, and philosophy, which have embalmed their memory; which have become universal models of taste and composition, and which have constituted the solace and delight of cultivated minds in every age and nation of the world." The Greeks wrote, they labored, they painted, they sung for immortality; and they have attained the end of their wishes.

The love of excelling acted on the mind of the orator in the land of freedom, the orator's natal soil, and where alone eloquence can flourish. The popular governments of Greece gave an opportunity for the highest talent to exert its utmost influence. How much better adapted to create the highest eloquence were the circumstances of Greece when struggling for existence, liberty, and power, as we ourselves now are, than those of Rome in the days of Cicero, her proudest orator? It was no idle contest for party strife and ascendency, or for ornament and display, that the Greeks employed the all-prevailing influence of their eloquence; but in cases of real interest, of momentous importance—where national liberty and independence were at stake, where the fate of the nation depended on the decision of the hour. It was employed to rouse the slumbering energies of the people against a domestic or a foreign foe. But, on the other hand, some of the most admired specimens of Roman eloquence are

on topics of minor importance, exhibiting mere art and ingenuity. No subject of great national interest, if the conspiracy of Catiline be excepted, ever called forth the eloquence of Cicero. Rome, proud mistress of the world, enjoying universal dominion, was in no danger from a foreign foe.

With all this emulation, thus directed, is it wonderful that the orators of Greece reached a point of perfection never since surpassed? Acting under such impulses, is it wonderful that Greek literature has been so eminently distinguished for simplicity, force, and beauty—that it presents us so perfect a picture of nature?

Under these circumstances, poetry and eloquence acted on minds not yet dulled by custom, or stupefied by indolence, or trammelled by rules; they spoke from the genuine impulses of nature, and they spoke to nature beaming from the breast of every Greek; thus situated, they could not fail of consummate excellence. In the eyes of such men, noisy declamation or affected sentiment would appear ridiculous and contemptible.

The genius of Greece, like her own proud Parthenon, stood forth to the world in majestic simplicity and grandeur, the admiration and model of all succeeding ages.

ARTICLE III.

THE RELATIONS OF LANGUAGE.

The first form of knowledge to which we are systematically introduced, is that of words. We are taught to pronounce them, to spell them, to read them, and to understand their signification, in our childhood. This is following the order of nature; for we can not express our own ideas, or receive those of others, except through the medium of language. Indeed, so intimate is the relation between thought and language, that it is impossible to conceive how man could reason without it. Pure thought, abstracted from all those signs that represent it, is a mystery to us. By the various combinations of words, all the thoughts of men are represented; and the whole domain of knowledge is laid off as a map, by which the track of each explorer can be followed; a region which otherwise would be dim, and peopled with shadowy forms, now becomes distinct and firm.

Most children who enjoy the privilege of a few years at school, remember so well the form of the many thousand words that compose a cultivated language, that they can call them at sight, or reproduce them by spelling or writing when not seen. This must be regarded as a very wonderful achievement of the memory, and shows what any faculty, even of ordinary minds, by attention and perseverance can accomplish. If the formidable nature of the undertaking had been comprehended at the outset, but few would have entered on it; but unconscious of its magnitude, they have performed what is not unlike the act of that military chieftain who could call by name all the soldiers of his large army.

Although, in the most general sense, language is the expression of ideas by signs; and in this sense is possessed

by the unfortunate mute, and even by the inferior animals, to each class of which Providence has given a few peculiar notes that they can not increase, yet is there a radical difference between such a language and the distinct utterance of articulate words, connected together in sentences, with emphasis and tones corresponding to the sense. The capacity to make those varied sounds which form a spoken language, and to combine those visible signs which constitute a written one, is peculiar to man; nor can the imperfect imitation of human speech by some birds be regarded an exception, with more reason than the transient effort of a trained dog to walk on two feet is to that other characteristic of man, that he alone walks upon the earth erect.

The prominent position which language, as the representative of thought, confers on man, is manifest, when we examine the refined and intelligent conversation of human beings, whether instructing each other with lessons of experience, or pleasing each other with sentences of genial humor, or sustaining and comforting each other under the trials and vicissitudes of this life: or on observing the assembly of divines, philosophers, or statesmen, where the important themes of religion, science, or government, are eloquently discussed in the presence of thoughtful hearers; or those more popular assemblies where, under the influence of words, an impulse is given to those vast improvements that are producing such a change in the aspect and condition of the world; or where those pious feelings are animated, which are the connecting links between the earthly and the heavenly. When we contrast such associations of men with those of the brutes, merely for the purpose of eating grass together in the meadow, or mutely ruminating under the shady tree, is it not evident that language is no mean element in that combination which enables man to retain the sovereignty with which God originally endowed him—a sovereignty that, from its very nature, imposes the necessity of unity on the nature that

possesses it. Nor was inferior honor conferred on language by Him who "spake as never man spake," when He trained and sent forth His ambassadors to preach, and gave them the gift of tongues, that they might "stand in the temple and speak to the people all the words of this life."

As the different degrees of human civilization depend on the different degrees of developement in the common reason and feeling, and as language is the representative of these, it follows that the language of a people will be an indication of their social position. In a rude state, man's ideas are few and simple, and so will be his words; but as the range of thought enlarges, as new regions of science are explored, as nicer distinctions in philosophy are perceived, as more refinement of sentiment is cultivated, as inventions of new methods to supply his wants, or gratify his taste, or promote his comfort, are increased, to the same extent must appropriate language be added to the scanty vocabulary of rude periods. But we do not refer to the number of words merely, but to the number and variety of the volumes in which these combinations of words, as expressing various important and elevated ideas, are contained. Tried by this standard, the modern civilization must be admitted to be in advance of the ancient. All the departments of nature, from the strata of the earth to the stars, have been classified, we may say, recently. The telescope, the microscope, the compass, and the numerous other mechanical aids which man, in modern times, is able to employ, have opened new worlds of investigation, developed rich mines of information, which the art of printing has extensively diffused; so that far more is known now, and by a greater number, than in the ancient world. While antiquarian researches have brought to light some interesting specimens of ancient art, yet it has never discovered a printing-press, or a steam-engine, or a compass, or a chronometer. It is not to be denied, that in

literary taste, and in some of the fine arts, the ancients have left models which will be the admiration of coming generations; but it must be remembered, that where the range of thought and effort is not extensive, on that very account the few things to which the attention is directed will exhibit proof of superior excellence. Besides, we presume the most enthusiastic admirer of the ancient civilization will not deny that in poetry and eloquence, sculpture and architecture, the moderns are much nearer on a level with the ancients than they are with the moderns in astronomy, geography, geology, chemistry, philosophy, and medicine, and the many arts which have followed the advance of these sciences. But after all, it is possible for a community to be eminent in knowledge, and yet savage in feeling, as has been proved by the history of many nations, and was proved in France during the latter part of the last century. Now, the moral and religious sentiments of the civilized world of modern times are more elevated than those of Assyria, Egypt, Greece, or Rome. It is not, then, the mere structure of a language, or the number of its words, that must determine the social position of a people, so much as the range of thought and elevation of sentiment generally expressed. If all languages had a common origin, then it is possible that a barbarous race might speak a language that is admirable in its structure. Or, it is possible, in the long history of a community, for an individual now and then to arise, who should leave behind him the evidence of superior wisdom and excellence, but this is not decisive in reference to the nation, unless we know to what extent such views and sentiments were entertained.

In the opinion of many, the origin of language is involved in great obscurity. Now, although the Sacred Scriptures do not directly assert that language was given to man by his Creator, yet we think this is the only reasonable inference from the facts that are recorded in them.

Man conversed with God, and with his wife, and named the animals, before his fall. He seems to have had the power of speech from the beginning of his existence. There is no mention of a period when he was dumb. He was evidently created not only with the vocal organs, but with the power and disposition to use those organs for the purpose intended. This view is in harmony with nature; for who is there that doubts that in the act of creation God determined and made it necessary that the eagle should scream, that the dog should bark, and the lion roar, as surely as that the first should fly in the air, and that the last should roam the forest? Now, why should any who regard these notes of the inferior animals as analogous to speech in man, be reluctant to trace it to the same source; or to believe that man began to speak as soon after his creation, and with as little difficulty, as the other animals to utter those voices peculiar to them?

If any should object, that man was endowed with reason and the power of invention, which the inferior animals have not, and therefore what was necessary for God to do in the one case, was not in the other, let him consider that man is taught many things by instinct, as well as the animals below him. The difference between the two is not, that to the one God gave reason alone, and to the other instinct alone; but to both He gave certain powers, in which the range of the one was very limited, and that of the other very extended; giving to both similar talents; to one no capacity to increase it, and to the other the power to improve it greatly. The faculty of invention was not given to create or originate, but to improve, to advance from a starting point at which man has been placed. Although in time reason might have discovered that certain things placed in the mouth and chewed and swallowed would appease hunger, and nourish the body, yet it was not in this way that man learned this necessary art; but God said unto him, "Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed,

which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat."

If God made such communications as these to man, it is evident that the knowledge of language was before that of the food that was necessary to preserve life. Those characteristics that are universal and constant, and distinguish one order of creatures from another, must be original endowments conferred in the act of creation. It might as well be supposed that man was created a crawling animal, but with a capacity to discover the mode of walking erect, as that he was created dumb, but with the power to teach himself to speak. If, however, it should be supposed that the instinctive sounds made by the inferior animals are not analogous to human speech, then an important question suggests itself. In what condition was man created? Was he created as an infant, or with his powers and faculties fully developed? If it should be supposed that he, together with all the other members of the animal kingdom, were created in the feebleness and dependence of infancy, let it be considered what daily miracles were necessary, for many years, in bringing them up from such a condition to one in which they were able to take care of themselves. Had those venerable records, which give us the earliest history of man, represented this to have been his primitive condition, what incessant objections to the authenticity of such a narrative would have been urged by those who are so jealous of any divine interference. We presume that those who admit a creation at all, will accept the account of it in this particular as natural and reasonable. There were mature trees laden with mature fruits. There were mature animals, so that the eagle, fully fledged and grown, was soaring in the air, the horse was prancing on the plain, and the great whale was throwing the sparkling brine, like a fountain, above his head. Man was mature. His stature was complete. His senses and his mind were fully devel-

oped. Why were they thus created mature? The natural answer to this inquiry is, that they might at once exercise these faculties in their appropriate functions. Man's limbs were created strong that he might immediately walk, and his senses and intellectual powers were mature, that he might instantly exercise them. Because of the mature condition in which he was formed, Adam was able to walk, to eat, to observe, to remember, to reason, from the moment that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Now, the organs of speech were as fully developed as his other powers, and for the same reason. He spoke as naturally as he ran or reasoned. He was able to express his thoughts and his emotions in articulate words, as naturally as to quench his thirst with water, or appease hunger with appropriate food. There is no reason for making an exception to this universal principle in the case of the vocal powers; there is no reason to suppose that, when the lowest powers of motion and eating, and the highest powers of reason and affection were active, that the vocal organs were dumb. Let not, then, the fact that the child is born dumb, and that he slowly learns to speak, be any obstacle in coming to the conclusion that language is of divine origin, for it was to anticipate this state of pupilage that man was created mature, and with all his powers in exercise.

It is possible that some may admit that man was created with mature faculties; but not for the reason that we have supposed. They may imagine that it was not that they might immediately exercise themselves in their appropriate functions, but that there might be no constitutional impediment to this exercise, when he should have discovered the proper method of doing so. This will certainly not apply to those functions which are involuntary. The lungs, for example, did not wait until man had discovered how they were to be used before they began to respire. But, in addition to this, we are persuaded that common experience will attest, that man never learns the use of any faculty or

power of nature by examining it merely in repose; but by observing it in exercise. The hand, for example, was not palsied until man, by examining its structure and reasoning on it, should discover its use. But there was a natural and instinctive use of it from the beginning. Indeed, the supposition of the objector is absurd, for many of man's faculties are not under his direct observation; and if all were, the faculties of perception and reason, which are themselves necessary to discover the uses of things, according to the supposition, must first learn, *a priori*, the purposes for which they were designed, before they can exercise their powers. No progress, therefore, was possible on this theory. The true conclusion, doubtless, is, that man was created with all his powers mature, and they were created mature that he might immediately employ them in the manner, and for the purpose intended in their creation.

Not to speak of those who have entertained the opinion that man has reached his present position by a process of gradual developement from the brutes, it has been a favorite theory with more respectable philosophers, that the primitive condition of man was exceedingly humble, if not savage, and that he has slowly raised himself to the different elevations which he occupies along the line of improvement. If man's moral nature was pure when it came from the Creator, it is not possible that he should have been so degraded. The two things are incompatible. And to suppose that God created him with a corrupt moral nature, shocks the soul that has been accustomed to cherish exalted views of His purity. Besides, there is no evidence that the human race has made any progress outside of the influence of revealed religion. There is no community of Mohammedans or Pagans now that are equal to the ancient Babylonians, Persians, Grecians, or Romans; nor is there any example of a barbarous community elevating itself without foreign aid. Language is the most ancient record that we have of many barbarous tribes, and the

philosophical structure of many of these languages forbids the supposition that they were invented by men of such degraded powers of mind as to remove them but a little above the brutes.

There is another position from which we may take a view of the origin of language. If we observe the organization of man, we shall discover a correspondence between certain organs and faculties, and certain other elements, very distinct from these, but without which these would be useless. For example, there is such an adaptation between the eyes and light, that the eye can not see any thing but light, and nothing else but the eye can see the light. There is also a similar adaptation between the air and the lungs, between the organs of digestion and the food, between reason and the properties and relations of things. Now, in all these cases, not only the organ, but the element suited to it, and without which it would have been useless, was the gift of the Creator. But is there not as perfect an adaptation between the vocal organs and those other arrangements necessary to produce articulate sounds, as between any other organ and that which the wise Creator has made for it, that it might exercise its peculiar functions? Did He create light for the eye, and air for the lungs, and food for the digestive organs, and did He not make for the vocal organs those arrangements that are necessary to form words? As we sometimes find the elements of nature having different relations, and having several uses, so language sustains so close a relation to reason that that faculty would be of but little more use without it, either in conducting its peculiar processes or in communicating them, than the eye without light. The principal design of the ear was to receive these intelligible sounds, because these are the sounds that it hears with most interest, and the air serves almost as valuable a purpose in transmitting these sounds as in affording vital breath for the lungs. These varied and beautiful adjustments evince too much of

the divine skill to permit us to deny His direct agency. Speaking is the proper function of the vocal organs, and we believe it was made necessary and natural by the arrangements of God, in the act of creation, so that man spake without any more difficulty than any other organ performed its proper function. The analogies of nature warrant the belief, on natural principles, that intelligible words were addressed by God to man just created, which his perfect constitution enabled him to understand and answer.

It may not be justly objected to this analogy, that there is a difference between those external material elements which, concurring with the human organ, enables it to perform its functions, and that more complicated arrangement by which the vocal organs voluntarily perform their function. We think this makes no difference. Some of these elements, in other cases, are material, as air; others are immaterial, as light. In some cases the arrangement is simple, as in feeling; in others more complicated, as in seeing and hearing. In some they are voluntary, as in walking or eating; in others involuntary, as in breathing and digesting. We think the principle we lay down is a solid one, that wherever a natural organ or organs exist, that all the arrangements for the discharge of their appropriate functions were made by the Creator, so as to necessitate the result without a toilsome effort on the part of His mature and perfectly organized creature.

Neither is the objection a valid one, that God supplied every thing that was absolutely necessary for man's existence, but as it was not necessary that he should speak, the plan was such the speech should be acquired by the invention of man. We think God was more bountiful than the objection supposes; that man was not limited to those things that were barely sufficient to keep him alive. The variety and richness of nature—many things combining beauty, fragrance, and sweetness—forbid us to suppose that

the penurious principle brought out in the objection was that according to which God acted in the creation of man. Man would rather have dispensed with many of these beautiful sights, and fragrant odors, and sweet tastes, than to have been denied the power immediately to understand and utter intelligible words; for the loss of this ability now he deems well-nigh irreparable. It was not more necessary that man should taste and smell, than that he should speak. There would also, doubtless, be quite a difference of opinion as to the relative importance of speech, as the medium of divine communications on the one hand, and of worship on the other, and the actual necessaries of life. Those who, like Job, esteem the words of His mouth more than their necessary food, would differ from those who are disposed to say, Depart from us, for we desire not a knowledge of thy ways, as to its value and necessity.

We shall reach the same conclusion in reference to the origin of language, if we follow another line of argument. Men learn to speak by imitation, and they speak that language, and that alone, which they hear. There is an analogy between the vocal organs, in this respect, and the hand with a pencil in it; the one imitates sounds, and the other imitates visible things. Models are necessary in each case. As man can not conceive or represent any thing with the pencil, but according to forms of nature which he has seen, so neither could his vocal organs imitate sounds of which nature afforded no examples. He may combine different parts of primitive forms, according to his fancy, but his invention is restricted to this sphere. The inventive power only combines existing materials into useful forms, in harmony with some law or principle of nature, which has first been discovered. We can conceive that there may be other properties of matter than those with which we are acquainted; but who can imagine what they are? It is possible that there may be other senses than those with which man is endowed; but who can imagine what the sixth can possibly

INPERFECT IN ORIGINAL

be? If man had never heard an articulate sound, what could have given him the idea that such a sound was possible? There have been, from the earliest period of the world, unfortunate members of the human family, who have been born deaf. And although they have had the opportunity of seeing persons engaged in conversation, and although they may be capable of readings words, and although their organs of speech may be perfect, yet they have never uttered an articulate sound, and they never seem to make the effort, because they can not form a conception of that which to them has no existence. But perhaps it may be asked whether, by imitating those sounds with which nature abounds, man might not at length invent articulate sounds and words. The analogy between these sounds and those words which are the signs of ideas, does not seem to be sufficiently close to warrant an affirmative answer. Persons partially deaf, who could hear many of these sounds, have never learned to articulate; and it is a well-known fact that persons who become deaf after they have learned to speak, lose the power of speaking intelligibly afterwards. If, then, man can not continue the imitation of articulate sounds after having acquired them, unless he can constantly hear them, we infer that it is unreasonable to expect him to invent them, never having heard them, and continue to repeat them when he can hear them from no other source. We conclude that man was created with the ability to speak intelligible words, so that when his Creator first addressed him in such words, he understood them, and without effort was able to reply.

It is not probable that this primitive language was as complete and copious as would be necessary for all the future wants of man, but only the present. As the design of language is to express his ideas, it was not desirable that man should have a greater variety of words than was necessary for this purpose. The nature of man, though mature, was progressive; maturity was the point from which it be-

gan to advance, as the feebleness of infancy is the point from which man begins to progress since. As the reason of the first man did not anticipate the ideas and discoveries which the combined reason of all mankind should afterwards develope, it would have been burdensome to him to have had a large store of words imposed upon his memory, which were without meaning to him. His language was sufficient for all the purposes of speech, and capable of improvement as he advanced in knowledge.

As there was originally, then, but one language, and as there are now quite a variety, the origin of these numerous tongues is a subject of interesting inquiry. It might, perhaps, be imagined that after man had learned the use of his vocal organs, that different forms of language would spring up, as natural offshoots from the parent stock. That there would, in the progress of time, be changes, especially by the addition of new words, can admit of no doubt. But changes as great as those that exist, and as various, and at as early a period in the history of the world as we know them to have existed, can not be satisfactorily accounted for in this way. The diversity in languages consists not only in one having more words than another, all formed after a similar rule, but also in pronunciation and grammatical structure. Upon the supposition of one universal language, those causes that now operate to produce changes, as conquest, commerce, and social intercourse, would have had no such effects, so that any change at first must have been voluntary. Even exposed to the influence of these causes now, when each nation has its own peculiar tongue, what nation has voluntarily changed the once established structure of its language? To be sure, the Chinese have been less exposed to these influences than other nations, but the writings of Confucius, which are two thousand five hundred years old, exhibit the same language that is written now. The Iberians, who are not a numerous people, inhabiting the south-western part of France and north-

INPERFECT IN ORIGINAL

eastern part of Spain, although so closely pressed by large communities speaking different languages, have retained their own language from time immemorial. The languages of barbarous tribes undergo but little change, and although the languages of cultivated races are gradually changing, yet what probability is there that in any period of time the English people would voluntarily change the peculiar modes of inflection in their language for that of the Greek or Latin? The philosophical structure of many languages spoken by barbarous tribes, forbids us to suppose that such a language was the invention of a people as uncivilized as those who now speak it. As there are about four thousand languages and dialects spoken on the earth, and as the race of man has been here only about six thousand years, there must, by the natural process, have been on an average one new language formed in less than two years; or, as the deluge took place about four thousand years ago, there must have been one new language invented and established every year. We have no faith in any such natural increase of languages.

Some naturalists account for the diversity of language in a different way. They argue that all men did not have the same origin, but were created in different geographical districts; that the same race, even, did not spring from one common source, but that "men must have originated in nations, as the bees in swarms;" that each of these communities would have its own peculiar language. This theory is based on an analogy, it is affirmed, between the plants, the inferior animals, and man.

We believe there is nothing in the Mosaic account of the creation to contradict this supposed plan of the creation and distribution of, at least, such plants and animals as are adapted by their constitution to a certain temperature. Indeed, the inspired history represents the earth at the creative word as bringing forth the plants and animals adapted to it, and the waters as producing the animals

suited to it; so that to this extent it favors the supposition that plants and animals peculiar to one geographical area were created there. Nor are we at all disposed to object to its application to man. We will not say that he is an exception. But, with all deference to the distinguished naturalist who is the ablest expounder of this theory, we think he does not give the law in those exact terms which science authorizes, and which would prevent confusion. The law is simply this, that plants and animals were created in those geographical districts in which they are found, provided the same species be never assigned to more than one district. If we could have seen the world immediately after the creation, every thing would have stood in the place in which it was formed, and we could have said of this, it was created here, and of that, it was formed there. But great changes have taken place since, and many plants and animals are found at immense distances from the place in which they originated. It may be they are found in every geographical district; it may be they flourish better in a place to which they have been removed than in that in which they originated. It is impossible, without a knowledge of the history of these, to assign them to their own province. There are other plants and animals whose nature will not so readily adapt itself to different climates, and hence they remain where they originated, and their birth-place can be more surely pointed out. But nothing is better established than that God did not create the same species in two different districts. Not an exception to this rule has been found. On this subject, we refer to the Principles of Zoölogy, by Agassiz and Gould, p. 186, where it is said, "No animal, excepting man, inhabits every part of the surface of the earth. Each great geographical or climatal region, is occupied by *some species not found elsewhere;*" and on p. 209, "We shall find, by the study of the different groups in detail, *that certain species, though very nearly alike, are nevertheless very distinct in two different faunas.*" "Neither the distribution of

animals, therefore, any more than their organization, can be the effect of external influences. We must, on the contrary, see in it the realization of a plan wisely designed, the work of a Supreme Intelligence, who created, at the beginning, *each species of animal at the place and for the place which it inhabits.* To each species has been assigned a limit which it has no disposition to overstep, so long as it remains in a wild state." This being the law, it follows as a necessary consequence that man was either created at different places and of different species, or at one place and of the same species; or else that he is so unique that there is not sufficient analogy between him and the subordinate creation to enable us to reason from one to the other. At one time, Professor Agassiz adopted this last supposition; for he says, "Whilst animals are of distinct species, in the different zoölogical provinces to which they belong, man, notwithstanding the diversity of his races, constitutes a single identical species over the whole surface of the globe. In this respect, as in so many others, man appears to us an exceptional being in this creation, of which he is at once the object and the end." But it does not seem to us at all necessary to place man, as an animal, thus beyond the pale of those analogies that are universal. We are satisfied that science should apply such tests to him. There must have been good scientific reasons constraining the mind of the learned professor, to say that all the races of men are of a single species. Why, then, did he not permit science to conduct him to the conclusion that it was impossible that man should have been created at but one place? This would have been consistent. This would have exhibited him as a docile child of nature. This would have saved him from that maze into which he so unfortunately entered, and in his efforts to extricate himself has hidden himself, so that no one can tell precisely where he is. But it is flattering to him to know that so many are anxiously search-

ing for him, and listening to every sound which will enable them to discover him.

The discovery of the law that the same species was not created in two different natural provinces, may assist the naturalist in his classifications, but no one would be content with the mere fact of finding an animal in this or that place in determining his species. For example, the mere fact of finding a drove of horses on the prairies of the west, would not itself prove that the horse was created both here and in Asia, or that there are two distinct species. Neither, if he found a race of negroes in the West Indies, would he, from this mere circumstance, conclude that it was a different species from the negroes of Africa. But knowing the means that man has of removal from one place to another, and the various motives or accidents that may cause such removals, he would attribute to this cause rather than suppose a violation of the law. It is too late in the day, from an observation of this kind on man, in conjunction with the present place of his residence, to determine that he was created there, and has always lived there. The various migrations and changes of mankind should induce caution in any conclusion on this subject. In such cases, the naturalist avails himself of history, if within his reach. Now, we have a history the most authentic, which says that the red man was not created in America, nor the white man in Europe, nor the black man in Africa, but all were created in Asia, and gives a history of the dispersion.

But it is said this history is perhaps authentic, but it confines itself to one race, and that the white race. But this interpretation can not stand; for, leaving out of view the disputed points as to origin, the rest of the history is as true of the other races as of the Caucasian. They were all created by God; they have immortal spirits; they are fallen; they die; they bring forth children with pain; they eat their bread in the sweat of their brow; their an-

cestors were swept away by a flood; and they speak as many languages as the white race. But besides this, we are told by a distinguished naturalist, who at the same time asserts that Moses wrote the history of the white race, that men originated in nations, as the bees in swarms. We can not reconcile these statements, unless we suppose that the Caucasian race descended from one father and mother, and that the other races came into existence by nations. Unnatural as this exposition of his opinion may be, we hope it may be the true one, rather than that he should mean to say that the Mosaic account of the origin of the white race is not true, because all races originated in nations, and each race was created in a different zoölogical province. In the history of man there are examples of those who, either from vanity or some such weakness, have imagined that it was only necessary to affix their names to spurious notes on nature to give them circulation. This is unfortunate, both on account of those who have yielded to such a temptation, and of those who hold the counterfeit papers as genuine.

It is generally admitted that man is a cosmopolite—that he can live in any habitable part of the globe. He was created with this nature, and it might be interesting to inquire why he was thus created? Evidently, that he might roam over or inhabit any part of his extensive domain, and thus avail himself of the benefits to be derived from every part of it. Every portion of it was capable of being made tributary to him. Now, had God created each race in a particular place, and for that particular place, would He not, probably, have limited them to that region by a nature or constitution similar to that which he has given to tropical plants and animals, for example, which will not bear transportation to a different latitude? Does not this pliability of his nature, by which he can adapt himself to sea or land, to warm or cold latitudes, to low or elevated

regions, show that man was not created in different places, as being exclusively suited to those places?

But it may be asked, if there is not a marked adaptation between certain races and the climates they inhabit? There certainly is. This very pliability of the constitution that enables man to go every where over the globe, accommodates itself to the peculiarities of the climate where he dwells, so as to enable him to thrive in it better than one who has been accustomed to dwell in a very different climate. You will do violence to nature if you conclude, for example, that the negro was created in Africa, because he thrives there, for it sometimes happens, with reference to plants and animals, especially those having this cosmopolitan nature, that they flourish better in regions to which they have been transported, than in those where they originated. The Irish potato, Carolina rice, the Newfoundland dog, are familiar examples.

It is not man alone that is cosmopolitan in his nature, but there are certain plants and animals the most useful to him that are similarly constituted. Now, when we find these dispersed over the earth, and flourishing in this or that region, we are not to infer that they were created there. There is a relation between the fauna and flora of a country, and a wise Providence created them together; but as man is able to carry those plants along with him on which he feeds, God, instead of creating one race in one place, with plants and animals suited to it, and another race elsewhere, with a class of vegetables and animals more appropriate for it, created man with a nature that can adapt itself to all climates, and certain plants and animals most useful to him, with the same nature, that he may carry them into all the lands whither he himself may go. Those plants and animals that have this nature were, most of them, created in the warm part of the temperate zone in Asia, as best suited for the race in its infancy, and that

in the dispersion they might approach both extremes of heat and cold gradually.

But some of these naturalists hold the opinion that these races of men are not only of diverse origin, but of different species. What is necessary in this case is, for these naturalists to agree as to the number of these distinct species, accompanied by a description of their invariable peculiarities. This they confess they are unable to do, because they say the races are so intermingled that a perfectly pure race can not be found. And yet they do not see in this very state of confusion the most satisfactory evidence that their theory is not in harmony with nature. Where does such an anomalous condition exist, among the other species of animals? The world might exist for ever before that great law which keeps the different species of animals distinct would be so overthrown as they say it is in the different species of men. In any other department of knowledge, similar opinions would be condemned as crude, and they are not entitled to any more indulgence in this, the most important of them all.

The difference in color is that which is chiefly considered by these writers; and yet there is not a living naturalist who would not disregard the nonsense of one who should object to the classification that includes a black sheep and a white one, or a black horse and a white one, in the same species, although such varieties are inexplicable. These varieties in the human species bring it into admirable harmony with other species of animals, and the cause is as unaccountable in the one case as in the other. Indeed, had the human species not exhibited these varieties in analogy with the other species of animals, these same men, doubtless, would have wondered what it was in man that made him an exception to the influence of a law so general in the departments of domestic plants and animals. There is a disingenuousness unbecoming philosophers in the appeals to popular prejudice on this subject. It betrays

a consciousness of weakness, as it does in the guilty man arraigned at the tribunal of justice, who selects the most ignorant and corrupt men for his jury.

Now, the diversities of language can not be truly accounted for by such theories as these. Agassiz supposes each race to have their vocal organs so modified as to necessitate different languages. But as he supposes there are but eight distinct races, the number of languages is entirely too great to sustain the theory. Anatomy has discovered no such difference in the vocal organs of the different races. There is as much difference in the languages spoken by one of these races, as there is often between the languages of two different races.

It seems very natural that the same reasons that influenced the wise Creator to make different species of animals apart, would lead Him to ordain such constitutional barriers as would keep them distinct; and if we find that there is no such barrier between them now, we may justly conclude that there never has been. One of these barriers is, the incapacity of one species to imitate the vocal sounds of another. There is no art by which you can teach the horse to bray. This does not result from any want of opportunity, for different species of the same genus are often together, but the difficulty is constitutional. But it is different with men. They learn to speak each other's language. Men of the white race speak the languages of the black and red races, and so they speak his. Indeed, if you take a child of one race before it has learned to speak its native tongue, and place it in the midst of other races, it will learn their languages with as much facility as it would have learned that of its parents. From which it appears that the different languages are not the voices of different species, but varieties of one common tongue.

The diversity of language can not be satisfactorily accounted for on the false theories of diverse species, or a diverse origin of the human races. Neither can we see any

motive sufficient to prompt human ingenuity voluntarily to invent these different languages, and to induce others to adopt them. Neither could they be accidental, unless God implanted some constitutional bias or tendency, which in this way developed itself. This confusion of tongues took place through the interposition of God, so that the race of man, which had existed about two thousand years, all speaking the same language, now began to speak differently, and so suddenly, that the very same men who had been accustomed to labor together were unable to associate with each other any longer. The same God who, in the former times, produced such a great change in the voices of men, did, at the beginning of this dispensation, bestow the gift of tongues on His servants, that men of all nations might hear them speak the wonderful works of God.

Great changes took place in the human constitution about the time of the deluge. Causes which had not so operated before, now shortened the duration of human life; so that the average age of the nine descendants of Noah was three hundred and forty-three years, whereas the average age of Noah and his eight progenitors was nine hundred and twelve years. The suddenness of the decline is evident from a comparison of Noah's age, which was nine hundred and fifty years, with that of Shem, which was six hundred years; a difference of three hundred and fifty years.

From the name Ham, it is not improbable that the black variety of the human species then originated, which, at the dispersion, determined the course of his migrations toward the sun. And then came this confusion of tongues, which dispersed the different colonies in different directions, the name Babel commemorating the one, and the name Peleg the other. It was the design of God that the earth should be more rapidly peopled, and the resources of different parts more rapidly developed, than by the gradual

advance of the race of population from a single centre. There were immense advantages to be derived from the organization of distinct nations, each prosecuting its distinct mission. All these important results were involved in this confusion of language and consequent dispersion.

In effecting this confusion of tongues, or causing this diversity of language, God may either have obliterated all traces of the primitive language, and introduced a new tongue altogether; or He may have permitted one community to retain the original language, and may have evolved out of this, as a germ, a great number of dialects, differing from it in a greater or less degree. We think this latter method accords best with His usual plan. He uses existing materials as far as they will answer the purpose. As at the deluge He did not destroy the whole race, and then bring in a new one; so in the confusion of tongues, He did not destroy the old language, but incorporated its elements into the new languages in different proportions. We think that usually the works and acts of God are so performed as to leave behind them traces of His plan of procedure. His works are historical. In harmony with this view, although all the languages of the world have not been compared, yet the examination thus far has convinced the most eminent philologists that all tongues have so many common elements as to indicate that they are different branches from the same trunk. Alexander von Humboldt says: "However insulated certain languages may at first appear, however singular their caprices and their idiom, all have an analogy among them, and their numerous relations will be more perceived in proportion as the philosophical history of nations and the study of languages shall be brought to perfection." And again: "The comparative study of languages shows us that races now separated by vast tracts of land are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat; it indicates the course and direction of all migrations, and in

tracing the leading epoch of developements it recognizes, by means of the more or less changed structure of the language, in the permanence of certain forms, or in the more or less advanced distinction of the formative system, which race has retained most nearly the language common to all who had migrated from the general seat of origin." "The largest field for such investigations into the ancient condition of language, and consequently into the period when the whole family of mankind was, in the strict sense of the word, to be regarded as one living whole, presents itself in the long chain of Indo-Germanic languages, extending from the Ganges to the Iberian extremity of Europe, and from Sicily to the North Cape." "From these considerations, and the examples by which they have been illustrated, the comparative study of languages appears an important rational means of assistance by which scientific and genuinely philological investigation may lead to a generalization of views regarding the affinity of races, and their conjectural extension in various directions from one common point of radiation." Not less explicit is the testimony of Julius Klaproth, whom no one will accuse of any partiality for inspired statements. He says: "The universal affinity of language is placed in so strong a light that it must be considered by all as completely demonstrated. This does not appear explicable on any other hypothesis than that of admitting fragments of a primary language yet to exist through the languages of the old and new world." From such testimony of these eminent philologists, and others that might be quoted, it is evident that the condition of language throughout the world could not be expected to harmonize better with inspired history than it does. They are so closely related as to satisfy even the sceptical philologist that they all emanated from a common root; and they are sufficiently diverse to interrupt social intercourse, and to disperse colonies in different directions. There is a gratifying conformity between the most thorough

and impartial researches of the most eminent comparative philologists, and the scriptural account of the original uniformity of language and the violent divergence from that original form into many varieties. If we consider that it is only among highly cultivated nations that language undergoes any changes, and that among these the changes are not so much in the structure as in the increase and pronunciation of words; and if we consider, too, that there have not been many such highly cultivated nations, we shall be at a loss to account for the existence of nearly four thousand languages in about as many years, from one, by those causes merely which are operating at present. It will not be satisfactory, on the one hand, to attempt to account for the general resemblance of languages by the influence which one nation at a former period may have exerted over another; for it is not the similarity between two, or even a few languages, that we speak of, but that which appears among them all, and especially in those words which are the names of the most familiar objects. Neither, on the other hand, can the diversity be accounted for by the supposition that skilful men designedly invented new languages, and persuaded their fellow-men to discard the old familiar language for the new; for we doubt whether the most ingenious man living could invent a language as distinct in structure and vocabulary from all existing languages, as many of them are from each other; much less, when so invented, that he could induce any large community of mankind to adopt it.

ARTICLE IV.

The Puritans: or The Church, Court, and Parliament of England, during the reigns of Edward the Sixth and Queen Elizabeth. By Samuel Hopkins. In three volumes. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1859.

Since its first appearance, Neal's History of the Puritans has been accepted as the standard work on that subject; nor is it likely to be very soon superseded. The author seems to have been peculiarly qualified for the task to which, with filial piety akin to that of Old Mortality, he devoted the best energies of his nature and the best years of his life. An Independent minister, of unfeigned piety, of orthodox sentiments, of highly respectable talents and attainments, with a profound veneration for Puritan institutions, ideas, and character, with some peculiar personal facilities in the possession of important papers relating to the men and times to be treated of, and in perfect sympathy with the freedom and glory of his country, he was unquestionably well fitted for his important undertaking. His style is uniformly clear, unaffected, and manly. It can not, of course, be compared, for a moment, with the style of our great classic historians; in vigor, in vivacity, in pungency, or in narrative tact, with that of Hume; in variety, in grace, in pictorial art, and in graphic force, with that of Macaulay; in pomp and magnificence with that of Gibbon, the procession of whose stately sentences is measured and majestic as was that of those Roman legions he so delighted to honor; but it is a style, nevertheless, which we can always read with satisfaction.

Of the author of the portly and ponderous volumes before us, we know absolutely nothing, save what may be easily inferred from the work itself. We were, therefore, wholly unprejudiced, of course, and we took up the work

with high hope; but we laid it down with disgust, not unmixed with indignation. It may be proper to say that only two of the three volumes announced have reached us. What could possibly have induced the author to write so long and laborious a work on such a subject, we can not divine. He evidently has no proper understanding of the Puritan character; and, of course, no intelligent sympathy with it. Judging from the materials before us, we should take him to be an unworthy scion of the old Puritan stock, ambitious and wrong-headed, without refinement of literary taste or thoroughness of literary culture, determined to do for himself what a good man, in the extremity of his anguish, imprecated on his enemy, as the sum and climax of every earthly evil—*write a book!* With this foregone conclusion arrived at, "in spite of nature and his stars," he cast about for a subject, and, as John Bunyan says of himself, "as he walked through the wilderness of this world, lighted" on the unhappy Puritans.

The style of the work is peculiar and provoking, if not piquant or picturesque. The first volume opens like one of James's novels—any one taken a trandom—but, instead of the inevitable "solitary horseman," lo! we have a couple of horsemen, who turn out to be Edward the Sixth and the Lord Protector, Somerset. Then follows an "imaginary conversation," not exactly in the style of the best of Walter Savage Landor's.

Now, we protest, *in limine*, against writing history after this fashion. A novel may be a good thing in its place, and after its kind. If a man can and will write a novel, such as has been written, and probably will be written again, which shall "hold the mirror up to nature;" shall abound with pure sentiment, with elegant and exact description, with delicate touches of human nature; which shall cause the purest and profoundest waters of the fountain within us to gush forth, as if at "the touch of the enchanter's wand;" the affections of this human heart, "by which

we live," to flow forth in streams of tenderness, of admiration, and of delight; if, in a word, he can and will give us a new Vicar of Wakefield, or a new Heart of Midlothian—we, for one, at least, shall be sincerely thankful. All we contend for is, that a novel is one thing, and a history is another; and that when a man professes to write a history, he should not so far confound things that differ as to give us a novel under the title of a history; or, as this unscrupulous writer has done, for bread give us a stone, and for a fish, a serpent. A woman may be a very good woman, and a man may be a very good man, still we do not like to see them resemble each other too closely in dress and demeanor; and must confess that we have always felt some sympathy with the honest Welshman, when he exclaimed, "I like not when a 'oman has a great peard: I spy a great peard under her muffler."

Never before, in the annals of literature, was there so little harmony between subject and style; the downright, determined, straight-forward, and energetic character of the men to be portrayed, and the tricky, gaudy, jaunty, affectedly picturesque and really burlesque manner in which they are presented. Even their worst enemies must admit of the Puritans that, whatever their faults, whatever their short-comings, whatever their errors of taste, of opinion, of principle, or of policy, they were not light, trifling, finical, but plain, serious, resolute, earnest, and able men.

The spirit of the book we hesitate not to characterize as grossly and offensively irreligious. What would those grave and godly divines, Cartwright and Travers, Baxter and Owen, have thought of a writer who could so lightly profane the awful name of the Most High, as does this irreverent scribbler on the 267th page of volume 1: "Good God! what a question;" or, on only the third page after, 269th, "By Jesu! sith thou dost provoke me;" and, "Jesu! saith she," etc., page 297; "Odds! my life, sir!" page 37, volume 1; etc., etc.

We have transcribed these profane expressions with ineffable disgust, and only because we supposed that without the exhibition of some specimens, at least, the grave charges alleged might be deemed undeserved or exaggerated. It must be perfectly evident that, whatever else he may be able to do, or fit to do, such a man is morally and intellectually incapable of writing the history of the Puritans.

The matter is not a whit better than the style and spirit of the work. It is astonishing how little these two large volumes tell us, not that was previously unknown, not that could not be readily found in a score of printed and by no means rare works—in Neal's History of the Puritans, in Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, in Jeremy Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, in the Zurich Letters, in Mather's Magnalia, in McCrie's Life of Knox, in the Life and Writings of Thomas Cartwright, taken in connexion with the Life and Writings of Richard Hooker—but that they tell us so little that was worth knowing at all, not to say that even this little might there be obtained upon much more moderate terms than wading through the deep morass of this "perilous stuff."

The ancient historians, Greek and Latin—Herodotus and Thucydides, Livy and Sallust—were comparatively disdainful of minute accuracy. They rarely condescend to refer to dates and authorities. Ὡς λέγουσι, seems to have been regarded by the father of history as a sufficient voucher for his most marvellous statements. The design of these writers was not so much to convey exact information, as to amuse or amaze the reader. They were more solicitous, therefore, to make a vivid and deep, than a just and adequate impression. Truth, indeed, they sought, they attained, they announced; but it was not so much literal historic verity, as ethical or dramatic truth, such truth as we find in Hamlet or in the Iliad. It was rather the truth of nature than the truth of history that they aimed at. A critical and philosophical history, like Grote's History of

Greece, or like Niebuhr's History of Rome, was unknown to the literature of classical antiquity. Hence it is a capital rule with the ancient historians, never to spoil a good story by fanatical scruples or ill-timed scepticism. Hence, they have not the slightest hesitation in putting speeches into the mouths of their historical characters, such as they deemed appropriate to the occasion. Still, Herodotus and Thucydides never ventured on the dramatic liberties in the formation and structure of their narratives, which the writer before us so boldly and blindly assumes.

We now take leave of Mr. Samuel Hopkins, not altogether pleased, it may be, but "more in sorrow than in anger;" a sorrow occasioned by the terrible remembrance of two mighty and mortal volumes, not to speak of the appalling announcement of a third of equal diameter and dulness, from which, thus far, we have been mercifully preserved by a benevolent blockade. No intelligent person can fail to have perceived, no evangelical believer can fail to have deplored, the undiscriminating censure and scorn with which the Puritans have been stigmatized of late, and in which every party, in any way or on any ground associated with them, justly or unjustly, intelligently or ignorantly, has been compelled to bear a part. It is to be feared that, under the hated name of Puritan, not only will good men be unjustly aspersed, but great principles fall into temporary discredit. So easy is it for those who dislike the polity and principles of the Presbyterian church, under cover of an assault on the Puritans, to assail the principles and disparage the men we hold most dear, that we think it not merely a service to the cause of historic truth, but a necessary act of self-defence, to enter on the inquiry, how far the Puritans are liable to the charge of being pragmatical disturbers of the peace of society, and fanatical despisers of the decency of divine worship; and what relation they rightfully bear to us, even if the charges brought against them be sustained and admitted.

In regard to this latter point, we wish it distinctly understood in the outset that we acknowledge no responsibility for the acts and principles of the Puritans, save so far as we were historically united in a common and heroic resistance to civil and ecclesiastical oppression under Queen Elizabeth and the Stuarts, and received in common certain great principles of divine revelation and canons of Scripture interpretation. That there is not merely misapprehension, but malice, in the tone now adopted when speaking of the Puritans, is evident from the fact that, in its bitterness and boldness, at least, it is quite recent. Even David Hume, sceptic and tory as he was, the champion of abuses and the apologist of tyranny, admits "that the precious spark of liberty had been kindled and was preserved by the Puritans alone; and it was to this sect, whose principles appear so frivolous, and habits so ridiculous, that the English owe the whole freedom of their Constitution."* The testimony of the historian of the United States to the same point, is uniform and emphatic: "The Commons of England resolutely favored the sect which was their natural ally in the struggle against despotism."† From the time of the appearance of Macaulay's Essay on Milton, in the forty-fourth volume of the Edinburgh Review, to the appearance of Carlyle's Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, we had imagined that a change, favorable to the estimate of the Puritan cause and character, had been going on in the public mind of Europe and America.

Since the commencement of the revolution through which our country is now passing, however, we have been pained to see a disposition on the part of many conductors of the public press and leaders of public sentiment in the South, to identify the insane and inhuman crusade now instituted against the people of the Confederate States

* Hume's History, Vol. IV., p. 141, Harper's edition.

† Bancroft's History of the United States, Vol. I., p. 298, and throughout the work.

with the creed and character of the Puritans; and to represent the shameless atrocities of the present war as the legitimate fruits of their teaching and example: not remembering that we are contending this day for the very truths and doctrines, in the political sphere, at least, for which the Puritans contended in Great Britain, and for which they were content to suffer the forfeiture of their estates, the mutilation of their limbs, imprisonment, exile, and death; that the war now carried on against us is the act, not of a sect, or of a portion, but of a "*united North;*" that if a Spring, a Breckinridge, and a Hodge, are to be found among its Presbyterian abettors, a Cheever and a Beecher among the Independents; Doctor Tyng, Bishop Clarke, Bishop McIlvaine, Bishop Whittingham, and Bishop Smith, are found as representing the Prelatic element of Northern society, and Archbishop Hughes and his satellites the Romish; that while, as Sallust tells us, worthy ancestors are a reproach to degenerate descendants, no one has ever been so wild as to imagine that the unworthiness of a remote posterity was just ground of reproach to a noble ancestry; that the most excellent things are the basest and most pernicious, when they grow degenerate and corrupt. The prince of darkness was once the son of the Morning, and Adam, who, by his transgression, "brought death into the world, and all our woe," was, in his creation, the son of God. The choice seed which Jehovah planted in Canaan, the noble vine was not more unlike the degenerate plant of a strange vine, which it afterward became; the godly generation which took possession of the promised land, under the leadership of the heroic Joshua, was not more unlike succeeding generations, who offered incense to the queen of heaven, and bowed down to Baal and to Ashtaroth, than were the original settlers of New England, the followers of Bradford, of Winslow, of Winthrop, and of Endicott, to their corrupt and degenerate descendants of the present day.

Certain it is, that no body of men in the South have sustained the cause of Southern independence with more unanimity, intelligence, zeal, and efficiency, than the ministers and members of the Presbyterian church. In the war inaugurated against the rights, the interests, the institutions, and the very existence of Southern society, in defiance not merely of the dictates of humanity, but in violation of solemn constitutional compacts and the most sacred pledges of public faith, it is known that several of our best ministers have been in the fore-front of the hottest battle; that no more precious life-blood has bedewed the altar of our country's freedom than that which has streamed from the brave hearts of Presbyterian ministers on Southern soil. And while our church or our country shall survive; while freedom, or religion, or learning, the noblest gifts of nature, or the brightest instincts of personal or hereditary worth, shall be treasured among men, never will the name and the memory of the Rev. Dabney Carr Harrison be forgotten—a gentleman, a scholar, a Christian, a minister, a martyr to his conscientious conviction of public duty and uncalculating devotion to his country. Among the illustrious worthies of ancient story, among the deified heroes of ancient song, in the golden records of Grecian fame, in the glowing chronicles of mediæval knighthood, in the ranks of war, in the halls of learning, in the temples of religion, a nobler name is not registered than his, nor a nobler spirit mourned. And among the glorious leaders whom God has raised up for our country, in this the hour of her deadly peril, none can be found whose names shine with a purer lustre than those of Daniel H. Hill and Stonewall Jackson, who yet esteem it their brighest glory, not that they have received the grateful plaudits of their admiring countrymen, not that they have received the respectful recognition of the friends of freedom throughout the world; but that they have been counted

worthy to be members and officers of the Presbyterian church.

It is, however, a gross historical anachronism to identify or confound the Presbyterian church with the Puritans. Puritanism arose in the Church of England. That church, and that church alone, is responsible for its existence. Puritanism was the protest of the Christian conscience of the more evangelical portion of the Established Church, against the errors and abuses of popery, to which not the superior clergy of that church alone, but the princes as well, from Elizabeth to James the Second, clung with such perverse and pernicious tenacity. The Presbyterian church was in existence, not in decrepitude, not in decay, but in unimpaired vigor, in uncorrupted integrity, before Henry the Eighth had renounced the supremacy of the pope; before Calvin had given his matchless Institutes to the world, or Luther had translated the word of God into the German tongue; before the southern provinces of France had been stained with the blood of the martyred Albigeois; before the morning star of the Reformation had arisen on England; before Charlemagne had restored the empire of the West; before Constantine had enthroned and enslaved the Christian Church. In the times and writings of the apostles of our Lord, not merely were the inspired articles of our belief and teaching set forth, not merely were the great foundation stones laid, on which the grand and beautiful temple of our harmonious system reposes, but not less the principles on which her ecclesiastical government is constituted and administered.

How grateful should we be to the great benefactors of our race; the men who have rescued from contempt or forgetfulness noble and needful truths; have taught them, with courage and constancy, in spite of opposition, obloquy, and loss; those high and gifted souls who have thrown out, as from a sunny fountain, imperishable streams of truth and rays of light; who have bravely fought the grand in-

tellectual and spirital battles of our race; battles for freedom, civil and religious; for intellectual enfranchisement and the sacred heritage of a divinely inspired revelation; the Apostles, the Reformers, the Puritans! The fundamental principle of the Reformation, common and dear alike to Luther, to Calvin, to Zwingle, and to Knox, was the supreme authority of the word of the living God, in opposition to all the figments of the human imagination, and all the decrees of earthly councils. The earliest and purest of the Reformers of the Church of England, as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Jewel, adopted the same great principle; although, from the peculiar circumstances of the kingdom, they were not able to carry it out with perfect consistency to its legitimate results. That they considered the Reformation in England incomplete and unsatisfactory on this ground, and for this reason, we have their own recorded testimony.* Adopting this simple and fruitful principle of the paramount authority of the Scriptures, together with the related principle of the personal responsibility of each individual to God for his belief and practice, the Puritans were not merely in sympathy and correspondence with the continental Reformers, but were the heirs and expositors of their doctrinal system, and of their views in regard to the constitution and government of the Church, considered as a visible and organized body. With this grand and generative principle of the supreme authority of the word of God in the entire sphere of conscience and duty, their subordinate principles were logically inevitable, and collision with the government of their country a fatal necessity. The inquiry of the apostles, whether we should obey God rather than man, is at once a clue to their perplexities and a key to their extrication. In the time and person of Henry the Eighth, the supremacy of the pope was merely transferred to the sovereign. The great body of popish errors,

* See authorities cited in Note R, p. 78, of McCrie's Life of Knox.

of popish abuses, and of popish corruptions, was retained by the bloated and beastly wretch who rejoiced in the title of Defender of the Faith, and who illustrated his claim to the title by passing sentence of death on the Romanist who denied his supremacy, and the Protestant who denied transubstantiation. In the time of Edward the Sixth, the Reformation in England made wonderful progress in a short period; when, for the sins of the people, it was arrested by the premature death of their wise and saintly king. In the time of Mary, the best of the English clergy were compelled to take refuge in Germany and Switzerland, to avoid the wrath of a bloody woman, hounded on by a bigoted priesthood. It was in her reign, and at Frankfort, that the Puritans, as a party and under that name, first appear in history.* The great Puritan controversy, however, first raged in England under the imperious and intractable Elizabeth. Her own personal tastes and religious convictions were with the Church of Rome, but her interests attached her to the cause of the Reformation. Had she professed herself a Romanist, she must have proclaimed herself illegitimate, and forfeited her title to the throne. She was, then, a Protestant, not by conviction, but, as the grammarians say, *by position.* But toward every thing distinctive of Protestantism, toward every thing characteristic of Protestantism, she was inveterately averse. She did not believe in the marriage of the clergy. She did not favor the general preaching of the Gospel. She kept a crucifix, with wax candles burning before it, in her private chapel. She gloried in a gorgeous ceremonial, and abhorred a simple and scriptural worship. The same absurd taste for finery which induced her to bedizen her plain person in gaudy clothing and splendid jewelry, inclined her to the purple pomp of the Romish religion. Her antipathy to the Puritans was far more intense and vindictive than her dislike to the papists. The papists

* Neal's History, Vol. I., p. 68.

were incessantly plotting against her throne and her life. The Puritans acknowledged her title, and were loyal to her person. Poor Stubbs, brother-in-law of Cartwright, after his right hand had been cut off by order of the Queen, pulled off his hat with his left and cried out, "God save the Queen."* But she hated them for their religion, and for those principles of civil liberty with which it was identified. "They fasted and prayed for the Queen and the Church, though they were rebuked for it, and punished by civil and ecclesiastical officers. They were suspended and deprived of their ministry, and their livings sequestered to others; and many of them were committed to prison, where some were chained with *irons*, and continued in durance a long time. The bishops tendered to suspected persons the oath, *ex officio*, to answer all interrogatories put to them, though it were to accuse themselves, and when they obtained a confession, they proceeded upon it to punish them with all rigor, contrary to the laws of God and the land. The grounds of these troubles were not impiety, immorality, or want of learning, or diligence in their ministry; but their not being satisfied in the use of certain ceremonies and orders derived from the Church of Rome, and not being able to declare 'that every thing in the Book of Common Prayer was according to the word of God.'"†

It is an affecting illustration of the divine wisdom and love, that God should have so bound together His best gifts and the highest interests and treasures of the soul, that we can not part with one without imperilling all. We can not

* Memoir of Cartwright, p. 95.

† Memoir of Thomas Cartwright, pp. 329, 330. See Swift's account of brother Martin's method of dealing with the fringe on his coat, in the incomparable Tale of a Tub. "But when he had gone thus far, he demurred a while; he knew very well there yet remained a great deal more to be done; however, the first heat being over, he began to cool, and he resolved to proceed more moderately in the rest of the work." Brother Martin represents the Lutheran and English churches, as Peter the Romish, and Jack the Reformed.

contend for one without gaining the others also. Thus, while battling primarily for religious freedom, the Puritans secured civil and intellectual as well. In like manner, the champions of intellectual freedom, as Erasmus, undesignedly overthrew or undermined the towers and ramparts, not only of intellectual, but of religious despotism.

What the natural sun is to the material universe, the Scriptures are to the intellectual and spiritual. In contending for the rightful supremacy of the word of God, in opposition to the mandates of kings and the decrees of councils, the Puritans conferred a priceless boon on the human race. They affirmed a principle, they established a right, which, in its power and compass, is alike immeasurable and inestimable. It gives to God what properly belongs to Him, and thereby secures to Cæsar what rightfully pertains to him, by a higher than a human tenure, even a divine obligation. Thus the doctrine of civil obedience, within the appropriate sphere of the civil magistrate, is not, as rulers are apt to imagine, enfeebled by the prevalence of evangelical principles, but entrenched and fortified, making our obedience to government a part of our obedience to God. His Bible is the weapon of Heaven, which strikes with resistless force against every speculative error and every practical evil. It is not less the storehouse of Heaven, which contains and confers every good and every perfect gift.

The apostolic history, as recorded in the Acts, is the type of the history of the Church in post-apostolic times and in all after ages. It is commonly said that history repeats itself; but here there is not an occasional, an apparent, or a fortuitous repetition, or partial resemblance, but a prophetic rehearsal—an inspired *resumé*—on a small scale and narrow theatre, of what should afterwards be enacted through all the circling ages, and over all the boundless globe. The dispersion of the Church in the first great per-

secution,* by which the seeds of eternal life were sown broadcast throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, may be regarded as a typical illustration of the method by which, bringing good out of evil, and making the wrath of man to praise Him, God propagates the Gospel over countries and continents which otherwise it would never have reached, or only after a long lapse of years. It may, especially, be taken as an illustration of His adorable providence, in making the persecution of the Puritans in England the occasion of evangelizing other lands. It may seem a reverse, and not less marvellous process, for the attainment of the same general end, that the Marian persecution should have driven so many Protestants from England to the Continent, to receive more perfect instruction in the faith, with gracious reference to the needs of their own countrymen; as Apollos, though an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, was thankful to Aquila and Priscilla for expounding to him the way of God more perfectly.† Thus, in the case of the Puritan refugees, we see how divine providence prepared the way for the diffusion of the true religion in England and Scotland in its utmost purity. He who, by a simultaneous, or nearly simultaneous operation on the mind of the Roman centurion and the Hebrew apostle,‡ so wrought that the error of the one should be corrected, and the other be instructed in righteousness and have the seal of baptism, caused the English and Scottish Reformers to enjoy the tuition of Calvin and other wise and godly men, so that they might be qualified in their turn to teach others also.

Among the early English Reformers there was no diversity of sentiment in regard to doctrinal theology. Whitgift, "the Pope of Lambeth," and persecutor of Cartwright, was quite as Calvinistic as Calvin himself, as is manifest from the Lambeth Articles, drawn up under his super-

---

* Acts, 8 : 1. † *Ibid.*, 18 : 25, 26. ‡ *Ib.*, ch. 10.

vision, and issued under his sanction. Until the time of Sancroft, the Calvinistic theology was universally embraced and acknowledged in England as the doctrine of the Established Church. The great practical point of divergence and controversy between the Puritans and their opponents, turned upon the power of the civil ruler—not to impose articles of belief, but to decree rites and ceremonies, to determine the government of the church, to evacuate its discipline, and to dictate its worship. This was what the Crown claimed, what the court-party conceded, and what the Puritans contended against. All the particular points of difference—as, that no one ought to be admitted to the ministry who was unable to preach; that those only who ministered the word ought to pray publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments; that popish ordinations were not valid; that only canonical Scripture ought to be read publicly in the church; that the public liturgy ought to be so framed that there might be no private praying or reading in the church, but that all the people should attend to the prayer of the ministers; that equal reverence was due to all canonical Scripture, and to all the names of God; that it was as lawful to sit at the Lord's table as to kneel or stand; that the sign of the cross in baptism was superstitious; that it was reasonable and proper that the parent should offer his own child to baptism, making confession of that faith in which he intended to educate it, without being obliged to answer in the child's name, "I will," "I believe," etc.; nor ought women or persons under age to be sponsors, etc.*—the determination of these and the like subordinate questions, depends ultimately on the great principle contended for by the Puritans, and before them by the primitive Reformers

* Memoir of Rev. Thomas Cartwright, by Rev. R. B. Brook. London: John Snow, 35 Paternoster Row. The propositions signalized above are, of course, alleged as specimens, not as an exhaustive summary of the points in dispute.

of the Continent and Great Britain, that in reforming the Church it was necessary to reduce all things to the apostolic institution. Travers, Cartwright, and after them Milton, adhered to this principle with not less tenacity, and enforced it with not less eloquence, than Calvin. "But I trust they for whom God hath reserved the honor of reforming His Church will easily perceive their adversaries' drift in thus calling for antiquity; they fear the plain field of the Scriptures, the chase is too hot; they seek the dark, the bushy, the tangled forest, they would imbosk; they feel themselves strook in the transparent streams of divine truth; they would plunge, and tumble, and think to lie hid in the foul weeds and muddy waters, where no plummet can reach the bottom."* This was the great principle, in the reception and affirmance of which all the various parties among the Puritans and Presbyterians agreed; and in the rejection and denial of which, all who were opposed to the Puritans were not less unanimous. To the discussion of this principle, we shall now briefly address ourselves.

In such a posture of parties it is a presumptive argument that those who contended for the authority of the Scriptures, conceived that their peculiar views were sustained by the sacred umpire whose decision they invoked. They would hardly have appealed so confidently to the Scriptures, if they had not felt assured that they could make that appeal with safety. Their opponents, on the other hand, not merely declined the authoritative arbitrament of the Scriptures in regard to the leading questions at issue, but expressly referred them to a different and inferior court of judicature. They advocated their adoption, on the ground of conformity to the will of the sovereign and the laws of the realm; on the ground of decency, propriety, and good taste; and grounded their use, so far

* Milton's noble treatise of Reformation in England.

as related to divine authority, not on the positive prescription, but simply on the silence of the Scriptures—a most "expressive" silence, surely, if it authorized the English hierarchy, culminating in the Archbishop of Canterbury and the headship of the reigning prince; the portentous additions to the public worship of God, wholly unknown to the New Testament; and the retention of rites and ceremonies which, if not in themselves idolatrous, were associated with idolatry; and confessedly retained, not in spite of such association, *but because of it*, and in order to propitiate and attract the adherents of Rome. That the opponents and oppressors of the Puritans did not pretend to rest their cause upon the positive authority of the word of God, express or implied, is evident, from the fact that they denied the necessity for such authority, and is conceded by their own apologists. Professor Keble, in his elaborate introduction to his edition of Hooker's works, endeavors to account for the fact that the great writer, whose works he was about to offer to the public, had assumed ground so low, for claims and conclusions so grave and high. His special difficulty is not that Hooker made so little of the Bible argument, but that he made so little of what is denominated Church principles. He attributes the particular line of argument pursued by Hooker to the circumstance of his early education among the Puritans; to his unwillingness to insist upon claims offensive to the foreign Protestants; and to a desire to sustain the authority of the Queen's government, and the consequent temptation to rest his plea on the obedience due to the appointment of the sovereign. The third book of the Ecclesiastical Polity is taken up in controverting the proposition maintained by the Puritans, "that in Scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in no wise be altered."

The doctrine held by Cranmer, by Whitgift, and by Hooker—a man incomparably superior to either in grasp

of mind, and in learning deep and various—was a modified Erastianism. It is, indeed, the only ground on which the church, of which he was the boast and bulwark, can be maintained; with the historical claims of popery on the one side, resting exclusively on prescription, on authority, and on tradition; and the Presbyterian church on the other, resting primarily on the eternal rock of the divine word, and sustained by the authentic testimony of the noblest confessors and witnesses for the truth of the divine word, from the apostolic age to the present day.

The Presbyterian church has ever held, in common with the Puritans of England, that ecclesiastical authority is not lordly, but ministerial; that nothing can be lawfully imposed upon the conscience for which the authority of God can not be alleged; that the draught of the constitution of the Church is given us in the Scriptures, not left to our own conjecture or choice; and that, therefore, it should be sought, not in the writings or practice of the Fathers, but in the infallible records of divine inspiration. And this draught they have held to be plainly, pointedly, and perfectly Presbyterian; the distinctive ecclesiastical offices and functions recognized in the Presbyterian church to be, not merely agreeable to the word of God, but ordained therein; to have not merely the divine permission, but the divine prescript; that the principles which control our ecclesiastical organization and action are not merely "regulative, but constitutive," to employ a distinction so clearly drawn and so impregnably established in the pages of this journal;* and that the constitution of the Church should not positively

* See Article x., January, 1861, in which the lamented author, Dr. Thornwell, replies to the Princeton Review, Article vi., July, 1860. The death of this renowned and admirable man, just at this crisis, and in the fulness of his powers, his usefulness, and his fame, can be regarded in no other light than that of a national affliction, a disaster to every cause of God and every interest of man; but the blow falls with peculiar severity on our own branch of the Church, of which he was so distinguished an ornament and pillar.

contravene the scriptural order is not enough; but that not going beyond the Scripture or adding to it must be rigidly conformed and confined to it.

That this is not a novel interpretation or peculiar theory, as affirmed, but the true ancient and accepted doctrine of the Presbyterian church, inwrought into her standards, proclaimed by her most honored and trusted leaders, and familiar to her most intelligent and zealous members, a single citation, not from a Presbyterian, but from a Prelatist and a High Churchman, may suffice to show. "Whatever is not against the word of God is for it, thought the founders of the Church of England. Whatever is not in the word of God is a word of man, thought the founders of the Church of Scotland and Geneva. The one proposed to themselves to be reformers of the Latin church, that is, to bring it back to the form which it had during the first four centuries; the latter, to be the renovators of the Christian religion, as it was preached and instituted by the apostles and immediate followers of Christ, thereunto specially inspired. Where the premises are so different, who can wonder at the difference in the conclusions."*

It was contended by the Puritans that, in refusing subjection to the decrees enforced upon them, they were not resisting the authority of the Church, for that they were not imposed by any ecclesiastical or religious authority. They did not, indeed, recognize the authority of the Church itself, when clearly expressed, to bind any thing on the conscience which the Bible had not made binding; but they conceived that the things sought to be imposed on them could, by no definition of what constitutes a church, and by no construction of church authority, be reckoned ecclesiastical. It was, on their part, simply a resistance to civil tyranny seeking to obtrude itself within the ecclesiastical sphere. During several reigns the religion of England was made dependent

* Coleridge's Works, Vol. V., p. 149, Prof. Shedd's edition.

on the personal sentiments of the sovereign, and was actually conformed to them, so far as legal enactments and apparent acquiescence on the part of a majority of the English people might be regarded as constituting such conformity. Thus the noted Vicar of Bray was, during several reigns, a representative character. During the reigns of Henry the Eighth, of Edward the Sixth, of the bloody Mary, and of Elizabeth, it was held to be the duty of the people to conform to the religion of the crown. If this view of the duty of the subject to the sovereign, and the relation of religion to the state, were correct, religion itself, instead of being the worship of the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning—instead of being the loyal and loving subjection of the soul to Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—would be of all things the most variable, both in its essence and in its manifestations; in the doctrine which it affirmed; in the duties which it inculcated; and in the worship which it prescribed. The headship of the pope of Rome, unscriptural, absurd, injurious, and hateful though it be, is still less offensive to the conscience than the relation which the monarch of England seems, at this period, to have sustained to the religion of his country; for the successive popes might be expected to adhere to the same general system of religion; the supremacy of the pope would be willingly recognized by every sincere papist. But the worship of the king of England, during this period of national and religious change, was the headship of one who, whatever his creed, must enforce what was offensive to a large number of his subjects. If he were a papist, he must, in the name of the pope, persecute his Protestant subjects for non-conformity to papal edicts, and opposition to papal interests. If he were a Protestant, he must persecute the papists for the denial of his ecclesiastical authority, and the neglect of his religious requirements. So that the death of one king, and the succession of another, would be the signal for the revolution

of the faith and worship of a kingdom. So far as the constitution of the realm was concerned, Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, were equally heads of the Church, and defenders of the faith. One thing is unquestionable, that they were not heads of the same church, nor defenders of the same faith. The church which Edward loved, Mary detested. The faith which Edward defended, Mary destroyed. What more monstrous; what more unnatural among ancient fables—the mermaid, half woman and half fish; the centaur, half man and half horse—than to set up one who might be a papist, like Mary; or a Protestant, like Edward; or half infidel and half papist, like Charles the Second, but altogether profane and licentious; as head of the Church, supposed to be a congregation of faithful men? The atrocious crime of repudiating and resisting the authority of the sovereign, therefore, in matters pertaining to religion, is not peculiar to the Puritans, but common to them and to every other body of men in England, whoever might be the reigning sovereign, and whatever the religion of the state. To persecute men for refusing subjection to what is confessedly not of divine obligation, but of human appointment, and which the objects of persecution reject, not in defiance or contempt of human authority, but in supposed obedience to the will of God—what appalling wickedness! And for brethren to persecute brethren for such a consideration—how unspeakably offensive to God and discreditable to the Christian religion! Any one who will study the Acts of the Apostles, with the Puritan controversy in his mind, will be surprised to see what correspondence there is in the spirit, the tone, and even the terms, in which the blinded Jews reviled the apostles and primitive believers, and the prelatic charges, and the spirit which dictated them, against Cartwright, Snape, Proudlowe, and Travers. Our sense of the peculiar injustice of the bitter persecution to which these excellent men were subjected, is heightened when we reflect that the very doctrines for which they

suffered were the doctrines of the primitive English Reformers; of Cranmer, of Jewel, and of King Edward himself. They all believed that the reformation of religion in England had not gone far enough.

We are, of course, aware that it is possible to attribute a disproportionate importance to a particular structure of church government, as compared with the doctrinal system revealed in the Bible; and that the hierarchical excesses of prelacy are due, in no small measure, to this very error. But this is an extreme not more perilous than the opposite, of an Erastian indifference to all forms; and it is an extreme to which the Presbyterian church in this country seems by no means prone. There is, undoubtedly, an intimate connexion, historical and moral, between systems of doctrine and forms of government. Unless, therefore, doctrine itself be a thing which may change and bend with times and with the humors of men, we see not how church government can be safely regarded as a matter of slight importance. The mind is a unit, and a loose and latitudinarian habit will infect all its exercises, and can no more be confined to one department of speculation, especially in the sphere of commanded duties, than we can say to the unchartered winds that they shall blow only in one direction, or with a certain degree of violence.

> "Uná Eurusque Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis
> Africus, et vastos volvunt ad litora fluctus."

As a matter of fact, we know, assuredly, that certain types of doctrine have been historically associated with certain principles of ecclesiastical regimen. The type of doctrine prevalent in the Romish obedience, as Palmer happily terms that corrupt communion, is as definite as notorious, and as characteristic as her hierarchical system. At certain times, but wholly without success, or with only very partial success, the attempt has been made to engraft an evangelical theology on the hierarchical system. But they

have been felt to be incongruous elements, and have refused to coalesce, like oil and water. The doctrine of Augustine, who has been honored as a saint, has always been felt to be alien to the spirit of popery, and allied to that of Protestantism. Of all the Fathers, he is known to have been the favorite of the Reformers, as he is of Protestant theologians now, on account of his vigorous assertion of the prerogatives of God and the doctrines of grace. In like manner, the Jansenists, who embraced and inculcated his system, have always been regarded as tinctured with heresy. Pascal, Nicole, Arnauld, eminent for genius and piety, and withal devoted adherents of the Romish body, could not escape the ecclesiastical ban, because of the earnest sympathy and eloquent support which they gave the hated doctrines of Augustine. So in the Church of England, from the days of Archbishop Laud to the days of Dr. Pusey, that party which has receded farthest from the spirit and doctrine of the Reformation, and approached nearest to the Romish communion in its views concerning the constitution and authority of the Church, has evinced most sympathy with the doctrinal tenets of that apostate tyranny. The vessel is naturally, we may say divinely, adapted, in material and make, to the liquid which it is to contain. We may expect, therefore, that the golden cup of sorcery, which is to intoxicate the nations, shall be unlike to the cup of blessing, which shall present a healing draught from the pure river of the water of life. Our Lord himself has warned us against putting old wine in new bottles; how, then, can we safely commit the old wine of Gospel truth to new bottles of popish or prelatical device? We can not but look upon any departure from the scheme of government sketched in the Scriptures, therefore, or any unauthorized addition to it, with only less grief and dread than we should feel in a voluntary renunciation of the faith once delivered to the saints.

The plea on which papists and prelatists have rested their gratuitous additions to the offices and worship prescribed by the apostles, and prevalent in the churches which they planted, is a profane reflection on the wisdom and goodness of the Church's glorious Head. Forgetting that the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God stronger than men, they would engraft their imaginary improvements on a pattern divinely given, and dishonor the chaste bride of Christ with the gaudy robes of the Babylonish harlot. The hands of man were never given to make a Church. The Sovereign Architect of heaven needs not the help of human builders, nor will He accept their unsolicited additions to His glorious work. As well might man seek by his gaudy fire-works to outshine the lustre of the stars of heaven, or the beauty of the beaded grass, or to rear a temple which shall compete with "this majestic roof, fretted with golden fire," as by the devices of his fleshly mind to add to the efficiency of the ecclesiastical regimen revealed in the New Testament, or to the spiritual beauty of the worship it prescribes.

> "Compared with this, how poor religion's pride,
> In all the pomp of method and of art.
> When men display to congregations wide
> Devotion's every grace except the heart!
> The power incensed, the pageant will desert,
> The pompous strain, the sacerdotal stole;
> But haply, in some cottage far apart
> May hear, well pleased, the language of the soul,
> And in His book of Life the inmates poor enroll."

If it had been our design to enter upon an extended vindication of the Puritans, it would have been proper to inquire why they should have been for so long a time the objects alike of courtly disdain and of popular odium; why the gay jesters, from the author of Hudibras to the author of Pickwick; why the grave historians, from Clarendon to Hume; should have made them the subjects of their scurrilous merriment and malignant sarcasm. We

should have brought, at least, into rapid review their majestic and precious contributions to scientific freedom and practical religion. We should have referred to that goodly and magnificent procession of divines and preachers who, teaching the apostolic doctrine in the apostolic spirit, are the genuine successors of the apostles, and the glory of the Christian Church—the elegant Bates, the heart-searching Flavel, the learned Owen, the penetrating Charnock, the philosophic Howe, and the saintly Baxter. We should not have forgotten their sympathy with the great cause of common school education in Europe and America. We should have spoken of the heroic fortitude with which they endured the utmost violence of persecuting rage, and the heroic energy with which they discharged the most perilous duties of pastors to the forsaken victims of a devouring pestilence. We should have pointed to the proud and peerless majesty of England, under the Puritan sway of Cromwell, when her force was felt, and her wrath was feared, throughout all Christendom. And we should have compared her then with the feebleness and degradation to which she so soon descended, under his most sacred Majesty, Charles the Second. We should have gratefully and reverently pointed to Cromwell's Latin secretary, the poet of Puritanism,

> "Whose soul was like a star, and dwelt apart;"

a Puritan in training, a Puritan in temper, of Puritan associations, and of Puritan sympathies; the man who embodied in himself every thing pure, and serious, and high, and noble, in the traits of the Puritan nature, and the tendencies of the Puritan time. Let it never be forgotten, when witlings and foplings sneer at Puritanism and the Puritans, that the greatest statesman who ever wielded the sceptre of empire in England was a Puritan leader; and that the purest and most sublime poet who has ever written in "the tome of our land's tongue," was of Puritan growth, with soul deep and harmonious as those organ-tones he loved so well,

clear and capacious as the cloudless sky; that this grandest of uninspired bards, this most Hebrew in spirit and in genius of all the sons of Gentile birth, was essentially and historically a Puritan.

> "But we can now no more; the parting sun
> Beyond the earth's green cape and verdant isles
> Hesperian sets; our signal to depart."

ARTICLE V.

LIFE, CHARACTER, AND GENIUS OF THE LATE REV. JAMES H. THORNWELL, D. D., LL. D.*

"We all of us reverence, and must ever reverence, great men:" for, adds Mr. Carlyle, in his terse, epigrammatic way, "the history of what man has accomplished in this world is at bottom the history of the great men who have worked here;" "in every epoch, the great event, parent of all others, is it not the arrival of a thinker who teaches other men *his* way of thought, and spreads the shadow of his own likeness over sections of the history of the world?" What remains have we of the hoary past, save a few monumental works, and a few names linked to those in eternal memory? All beside is buried in the forgetfulness of history, from which there is no resurrection. And when this busy time of ours shall retreat before the coming age that crowds it back, how few that now write, and plot, and work, will flit

---

* The following article is a Discourse commemorating the life and labors of the late Rev. Dr. Thornwell, delivered in the Presbyterian church, Columbia, South Carolina, on the evening of September 17, 1862, at the request of the officers of the church, and in the presence of members of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary.

among the shades, and be known as the men without whom history could not have been? The world's great masters must needs be few. As from the earth's undulating surface only here and there a mountain peak lifts its solemn front in solitary grandeur, wrapping the grey clouds around its head, so only at intervals does a true thinker lift himself above the mean level upon which other men more humbly tread. The integration of society demands this gradation in mind, this relation between teacher and taught, between the leader and the led; and no such democracy will ever be established, in which the many do not bow with the instinct of loyalty before the imperial supremacy of those whom God has given to be princes in intellect among them.

Christian fathers and brethren, such a thinker has passed from the midst of us; and we sit together this day under the shadow of a bitter bereavement, doing homage to one of earth's best heroes—it is assembled Greece placing the laurel wreath upon the brow of one who wrestled nobly in the Olympic game of life. A bright and beautiful vision has vanished from us for ever: a man gifted with the highest genius,—not that fatal gift of genius which, without guidance, so often blasts its possessor, its baleful gleam blighting every thing pure and true on earth,—but genius disciplined by the severest culture, and harnessing itself to the practical duties of life, until it wrought a work full of blessing and comfort to mankind; a mind which ranged through the broad fields of human knowledge, gathered up the fruits of almost universal learning, and wove garlands of beauty around discussions the most thorny and abstruse; an intellect steeped in philosophy, which soared upon its eagle wings into the highest regions of speculative thought, then stooped with meek docility and worshipped in childlike faith at the cross of Christ; a man who held communion with all of every age that had eternal thoughts, and then brought the treasures hoarded in the literature of the past, and sanctified them to the uses of practical religion. Yet,

a man not coldly great, but who could stoop from lofty contemplation to sport and toy with the loving ones around his hearthstone; with a heart warm with the instincts of friendship, so brave, so generous and true, that admiration of his genius was lost in affection for the man, and the breath of envy never withered a single leaf of all the honors with which a grateful generation crowned him. Alas! that death should have power to crush out such a life! Our Chrysostom is no more! The "golden mouth" is sealed up in silence for ever!

> "The chord, the harp's full chord, is hushed;
> The voice hath died away,
> Whence music, like sweet waters, gushed
> But yesterday."

"The glory of man is as the flower of grass;" "our fathers, where are they: and the prophets, do they live for ever?" The men who with their heroic deeds make history to-day, become its theme and song to-morrow!

This rude outline, dashed upon the canvass, it is the privilege of one who loved him well to fill up now with cautious touches; and if the affection of the artist should impart a warmth of coloring to the picture, the truthfulness of the portraiture will yet, we trust, vindicate itself to those who knew the original.

Dr. James H. Thornwell was born of poor but honorable parentage, December 9, 1812, in the District of Chesterfield, South Carolina; but as his parents removed, in the second month of his infancy, into Marlborough, he always hailed from the latter District, where he simply escaped being born, and with which the associations of his boyhood were identified. By the early death of his father, a young family was thrown, in straitened circumstances, upon the guidance of a widowed mother, who proved, as is so often the case, equal to her high trust. She is described by those who knew her, as a woman possessing a vigorous understanding, great strength of will, firmness of purpose, and a boundless am-

bition for the advancement of her sons, in whom she traced indications of more than ordinary mental endowments. We are thus furnished with another illustration of a popular theory, that in the transmission of natural qualities from parent to child, intellectual traits come predominantly from the maternal side, while perhaps the moral qualities descend more conspicuously from the paternal. It may well be questioned if history reveals a single instance of a truly great man who had a fool for his mother. It is still more important to observe, in this case, the fulfilment of His promise, who has said: "Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive, and let thy widows trust in me." Who has not been compelled to notice the blessing of God upon these broken households, in which a feeble and desolate woman has lifted up her soul to God for strength to bear the burdens of her own sex, increased by those which should have devolved upon her stricken fellow; amidst weakness and pain, poverty and sorrow, toiling to support her fatherless ones, and reaping, in the lapse of years, the pious widow's reward, in seeing her orphan children emerge from obscurity and want to the highest distinctions in society? The full recompense of her toil and tears was meted out to this widowed mother; she lived to see her prophetic hopes realized, as her son, clothed with all the honors of the academician, sat among the senators and nobles of the land, the noblest patrician of them all, the pride of his native State, the joy and ornament of the Church, and, with a fame spread over two continents, the peerless man of his time. At length, in a satisfied old age, she lay down to her long rest beneath his roof; and now the lasting marble speaks the reverence he felt through life for her to whose firm guidance the waywardness of his youth was so much a debtor.

The education of young Thornwell was commenced in one of those log-cabin schools which have not yet entirely disappeared from the country. But the first teacher whose

name deserves to be linked with his in grateful remembrance was a Mr. McIntyre, from North Carolina, who taught in his mother's neighborhood one of those mixed schools, partly supported by the free-school policy of the State and partly by the fees of more affluent scholars. Upon removing to a different portion of the District, Mr. McIntyre determined upon taking with him a pupil in whose rare promise he had become so deeply interested, and effected an arrangement by which he was gratuitously boarded in the family of Mr. Pegues, while he imparted an equally gratuitous instruction. A sentiment of delicacy would prompt the historian to pass over these more private facts, if they did not form the links in the chain of opportunities furnished by a gracious Providence, and without which this youth might have shared the fate of those hapless sons of genius deplored by Gray:

> "Whose hands the rod of empire might have swayed,
> Or waked to ecstacy the living lyre.
>
> "But knowledge to their eyes her ample page,
> Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll;
> Chill penury repressed their noble rage,
> And froze the genial current of the soul."

Another hand was now stretched forth to pluck from obscurity our "mute, inglorious Milton." A physician, Dr. Graves, whom professional attendance at the house of Mr. Pegues brought occasionally into contact with the subject of our story, was so impressed with his precocious talents as to make him the burden of frequent, and of what seemed then, extravagant panegyric. Amongst others, he expatiated before General Samuel W. Gillespie upon the youthful prodigy he had discovered, as one who might become, with the advantages of education, the future President of the country. This hyperbole, so illustrative of our democratic way of thinking, is quoted here only to show the profound impression which his unquestioned genius made from earliest youth upon all with whom he was associated.

Upon the strength of such representations, General Gillespie, with his brother, James Gillespie, and Mr. Robbins, at that time a legal practitioner in Cheraw, resolved conjointly to secure his education. Pale and sickly in appearance, and of extremely diminutive stature, his personal presence seemed a burlesque of the hopes entertained on his behalf, and provoked many a quiet jest at the expense of those who had ventured such lofty predictions of his future eminence. But these forgot the apothegm of Watts, "the mind is the measure of the man;" and never did a frail body enshrine a spirit of nobler mould, a soul more allied to the God who gave it. His removal, in 1825, to Cheraw, consequent upon these new relations, brought him under the immediate superintendence of his patron, Mr. Robbins; with whom he lived, and who undertook his private instruction, evincing from the beginning his appreciation of his ward, by lifting him at once into the confidence and intimacy of an equal. He was soon, however, transferred from the private preceptorship of Mr. Robbins to the more systematic discipline of the Cheraw Academy, where he remained until prepared for admission into college. It is instructive to pause at every stage in such a history and trace the influences by which a capacious intellect was trained for unparalleled usefulness and honor. It can not be doubted that a familiar association of five years with an improved and mature mind, stimulated a most rapid and vigorous developement of mind and character. Few laid aside at so early an age the things of a child, and assumed so early the attitude and proportions of a man. Possessing, according to his own testimony, the ambition to become all that was possible—with a burning thirst for knowledge which no acquisitions could quench, he had daily before his eyes, in his patron and friend, what seemed to him the personification of knowledge; and whose fuller stores poured forth in hourly converse the aliment upon which a growing mind would delight to feed. Under the

promptings of such a noble ambition, with a lofty ideal ever beckoning him forward, he laid in these early years the foundation of those habits of intense application which never deserted him to the close of life; and here, too, was laid the basis of that accurate scholarship which only needed the enlargement of after years and fuller opportunities to render him the wonder he became in the eyes of scholars like himself. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this history is, the happy training by which he was disciplined from the opening of his career. Not only did he study while other boys gambolled and sported; not only did he dig into the intricacies of obsolete languages through the long watches of the night, whilst other boys slept; but he always studied the right things, in the right time, and in the right way. Whether by the instinct of his own genius, or whether by the wise direction of his superiors, or whether by the mysterious guidance of an unseen providence, which men call accident, or whether by all these combined, he read the best books, and precisely at the time to secure their determining influence upon himself. The light works written for amusement, and which at most but embellish the taste and enrich the fancy, had no charms even to his boyish mind. Like the Hercules of ancient story, he rose from his cradle to giant labors; and so became the Hercules of whom to tell all the truth would seem to many to convert him into a myth. An incident may be recorded here, not only because it falls within the chronology of this period, but as a striking illustration of the foregoing observations. Being detected once by his friend, Mr. Robbins, with Mr. Locke's Essay in his hands, he was playfully bantered upon the hardihood of undertaking a work so far beyond his years and the developement of his intellect. Piqued, as he himself testifies, by this implied disparagement of his powers, he resolved at once to master the book; and master it he did, completely and for all coming time. Shortly after, chancing to light upon Stewart's Elements of

the Philosophy of the Human Mind, he devoured this also with avidity. Dr. Doddridge tells us a dream which he once had in sleep: that having passed through death into the world of spirits, he first found himself in a spacious chamber whose walls were covered with strange hieroglyphs. Upon close inspection, these resolved themselves into a perfect map of his own life, with all its intersections and connexions, and every influence which had contributed to shape his destiny. It scarcely needs a revelation from another world to determine the effect of this incident in giving its final direction to a mind which was, perhaps, the only mind on this continent which could be classed without peril with that of Sir William Hamilton. It gave him a bias to philosophy from which he never swerved, and was the pivot upon which the whole intellectual history of the man afterwards turned.

In December, 1829, he matriculated in the South Carolina College, and from the hour of his entrance within its classic walls, the superiority of his genius was universally acknowledged. Coupling the fervor of an American student with the assiduity of the German, he devoted fourteen hours a day to severe study. It does not, therefore, surprise us that he bore off, in 1831, the highest honors from rivals, some of whom have since achieved eminence in civil and political life. Either he intuitively penetrated the character of the age in which he lived, and pierced the fallacy which supposes that genius can win permanent success without learning, as the material upon which, and the instrument by which, it must work; or else he was led blindly on by an avaricious love of knowledge, rendering the toil with which it is gathered itself a delight; but certain it is, he turned away with the severity of an anchorite from the blandishments of society; and like an athlete of old, with continuous and cruel rigor trained every muscle and every limb for the Olympic race and the Olympic prize before him in life. During his college career, he omitted no opportunity

of discipline, neglected no part of the prescribed curriculum, wasted no hour in dissipation or indolence; but with elaborate care prepared himself for every public exercise. In the literary society of which he was a member, the same assiduity availed itself of every privilege. Despising the baldness of mere extemporaneous harangues, he armed himself for the conflict of debate; and few were they who could withstand his vigor of argument, or parry his trenchant criticism, when he chose to indulge his power of sarcasm and invective. This example, with its attendant and grand results, stands up in scorching rebuke of the egotism and folly which would exalt the triumphs of genius by disparaging the discipline through which its energies are directed. As iron sharpeneth iron, so the mind confesses its obligation to any influence by which it has insensibly been toned. Dr. Thornwell, in later years, gratefully acknowledged the benefit he derived in college from contact with the classical taste and attainments of Dr. Henry, the Professor of Philosophy at the time; the enjoyment of whose friendship he recognized as one of the felicities of his college course, and by whom he was both stimulated and directed in the acquisition of classic and philosophical lore.

This devotion to study does not, however, appear at this period to have been sanctified by the love or the fear of God. His religious character was totally unformed. It was a noble idolatry, indeed; but still, as an idolater, he worshipped only at the shrine of learning, and offered the sacrifice of his devotion to ambition as his only God. As regards religion, in the language of another, "He had no catechism but the creation, employed no study but reflection, and read no book but the volume of the world." Yet the analogy of Providence forbids the supposition that so select an instrument of the divine glory should not, during this critical and forming period, have been unconsciously trained for his future work in the Church of God. It would be strange if some religious element were not secretly in-

troduced into the solution from which such a crystal must shortly be formed; reflecting, as it afterwards did, from every angle the glory of the Redeemer—the prism through which so many rays of divine truth were transmitted, and lent their hue to other minds. The lapse of thirty years will often sink into the repose of death the passions which once agitated society to its depths. The opinions and actions of one generation are calmly reviewed by the next, and history pronounces her impartial and irreversible verdict. It is simply a matter of history that, at the period of which we are now treating, the college was the seat of infidelity. Its President, Dr. Cooper, in the language of the college historian,* "had drunk deep at the fountain of infidelity; he had sympathized with the sneering savans of Paris, and sat at the feet of the most sceptical philosophers of England;" "the strongest feeling of his nature was the feeling of opposition to the Christian religion, which he believed to be a fraud and imposture." It was not wonderful that the Christian people of the State rose up to defend "the altars which he proposed to subvert," and to protect their sons "against the influence of a false and soul-destroying philosophy, a species of Pyrrhonism, a refined and subtle dialectics which removed all the foundations of belief, and spread over the mind the dark and chilling cloud of doubt and uncertainty." The issue was slowly but stubbornly joined between the religious faith of the masses, on the one hand, and a cold, bloodless deism on the other, which had throned itself upon the high places of intelligence and power, and was poisoning the very fountains of knowledge in the State. It was scarcely credible that such a conflict should fail to arrest the attention of our pale and patient student; whose dialectic ability would cause him, with almost the love of romantic adventure, to seek truth in the wild clash of opposing opinions. We find him, accordingly,

* Dr. Laborde's History of the South Carolina College, pp. 175–7.

bending the vigor of his intellect to an examination of the claims of deism; and rising, after a careful perusal of its ablest apologists, with an intelligent conviction of the necessity of a divine revelation. He next turned to the investigation of Socinianism, towards which he confessed an early bias, and of whose truth he ardently desired to be convinced. With the knowledge we have of his whole character, as developed in later years, it would greatly interest us to trace the mental conflict through which he must now have passed; and did we not know the result, we might tremble for the decision which is to be rendered. On the one hand, it was a system peculiarly attractive to a mind so speculative as his. Its destructive criticism strips Christianity of all that is supernatural, and drags its sublimest mysteries before the bar of human reason. It degrades "the signs and wonders" of the Bible into the legends of a fabulous age; or converts them into myth and allegory, the mere symbols of philosophy, masking its teaching under the guise of fancy; or construes them into the jugglery of nature, beneath which we are to detect the working only of her secret and invariable laws. Shall our student be dazzled with the boldness of a system which

> "Soars untrodden heights, and seems at home
> Where angels bashful look;"

which professes to subdue things divine under the dominion of reason; and, offering to compass all truth, puffs up the soul with vanity; which intoxicates the mind by its promise of unbridled liberty of thought? Or, on the other hand, shall his earnest spirit, longing for the positive and the real, turn away from its endless negations; from a system which only offers a destructive criticism in lieu of a constructive faith; and which substitutes the abstractions of reason in the place of a substantive testimony? Before the fervor of his gaze will not these airy speculations, woven of the mist and the sunlight, melt away like the de-

ceitful mirage upon the distant horizon? Still more, shall not his warm and loving heart find itself chilled in the frozen atmosphere of a system which offers nothing to the embrace of the affections? Can such a nature as his be content to dwell in the beautiful snow houses of this polar latitude, shining, indeed, with crystalline splendor, but beneath a sun which neither cheers nor warms? The decision trembles not long upon the balance: he turns away from Socinianism with the indignant sarcasm of Mr. Randolph: "What a Christless Christianity is this!" He would not have "the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out." Thus far, a purely intellectual examination had conducted him to an intellectual recognition of the Scriptures as the revelation of God, and of Christianity as the scheme it unfolds. Upon the interpretation of this book he had framed no hypothesis, and had formed no system of doctrinal belief. He was not, however, to rest here. Stumbling, during an evening stroll, into the bookstore of the town, his eye rested upon a small volume, entitled "Confession of Faith." He had never before heard of its existence: he only saw that it contained an articulate statement and exposition of Christian doctrine. He purchased and read it through; and for the first time felt that he had met with a system which held together with the strictest logical connexion. He could not pronounce it true without a careful comparison of the text with the scriptural proofs at the foot of each page. But he was powerfully arrested by the consistency and rigor of its logic: granting its fundamental postulates, all the conclusions must follow by necessary sequence. This book determined him as a Calvinist and a Presbyterian; although he had never been thrown into any connexion with this branch of the Church of Christ, and had never been, except in one instance, within any of their sanctuaries of worship. The circumstance, however, of most interest in the whole series, is the fact that the chapter which most impressed him in this "Confession"

was the chapter on Justification—that doctrine which is the key to the whole Gospel; as Luther styles it, "*articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ.*" How parallel with the history of Luther himself, and of the great Reformers of the sixteenth century! who by this clue extricated themselves from the labyrinth of popery, and who built Protestant Christianity upon it, as the keystone of the arch by which the whole superstructure was supported. Those who recall the fierce conflict which raged in the Presbyterian church at the very time our friend was introduced into its ministry, and who remember the distinguished part he was called to bear in defence of the very doctrines of the Reformation, which are only the doctrines of grace, can not fail to recognize here the wonderful method by which he was unconsciously trained for a similar work of reform. None can fail to see that those who are raised up to be the champions of truth in an age of defection and strife, and those who are destined to shape the theology of their age, must drink the truth from no secondary streams, but fresh from the oracles of God, and from those symbolical books in which the faith of the universal Church is sacredly enshrined. But if these researches led him within the temple of Christian truth, it was only to wonder, and not to worship. He stood beneath its majestic dome, and mused along its cathedral aisles, as before he had wandered through the groves of the academy, or paused beneath the porch of the stoic. The Gospel was nothing more than a sublime philosophy: and if it secured the homage of his intellect, it failed as yet to control the affections of his heart. If he seemed to sit with reverence at the feet of the great Teacher, it was only as a teacher,—something greater than Socrates, and more divine than Plato. The seed must lie dead for a time. How soon it was to germinate, and what fruit to bear, we shall shortly trace.

Upon his graduation, in December, 1831, he left the halls of his *Alma mater*, followed by universal predictions of his

future greatness. In whatever quarter of the heavens he should chance to rise, and in whatever constellation to shine, all expected in him a star of the first magnitude. But a few years elapsed when, by the path of these same predictions, he returned to the college, to be as distinguished among its teachers as he had before been among its pupils. In the opening of his twentieth year, he entered, as student of law, the office of his patron, Mr. Robbins; but did not long remain. His spirit of manly independence could not brook longer to be a pensioner upon the bounty of those who had befriended him thus far; he must, also, stretch the hand of help to those of his own blood who desired likewise to climb the steep ascent of knowledge. He accordingly devoted the two years of 1832 and 1833 to teaching, first in Sumterville, and then at Cheraw, the scene of his early academic toils. During the first of these years, the seed of religious truth, which had been secretly swelling in the soul, burst through the parted crust, in the tender blade. In the spring of 1832, he united, by open profession of his faith, with the Concord Presbyterian church, near Sumterville. Thus did the sovereign spirit of God, who chooses His own avenue of approach, come to him through the convictions of the intellect and by the logic of the understanding. But He who had previously so illuminated the mind, now quickened the affections and subdued the will; and with "every thought brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ," our friend bowed, with all his powers united, before the cross. Thwarting the instincts of his own ambition and the fond hopes of political preferment cherished by his admirers, he forthwith resolved upon devoting himself to the "ministry of reconciliation." This resolution was formed and kept under the pressure of a tremendous conviction. Three years later, at the period of his licensure, whether through a conscientious apprehension of the sacredness of the office, or whether through an earthly ambition not wholly subdued, he cherished the

secret hope of being rejected by the Presbytery, upon whom would devolve the responsibility of releasing him from the pressure of the Apostle's woe. It is a fearful struggle when, once for all, a noble spirit brings its longing after fame and lays it down a perpetual sacrifice to conscience and to God. For though the pulpit has its honors and rewards, woe! woe! to the man who enters it under this temptation—

> "To gaze at his own splendor, and exalt,
> Absurdly, not his office, but himself."

The shadow of a fearful curse falls upon him who "does this work of the Lord deceitfully," who can not with a purged eye look beyond the meed of human applause to the benediction of the great Master as his final crown. During these two years of retired and scholastic improvement, he prosecuted with diligence the study of divinity; and in 1834, went to the University of Cambridge, where, through several months, he perfected his knowledge of Hebrew. In the autumn of the same year, he was licensed as a probationer by the Presbytery of Harmony, and soon after commenced his ministerial labors in the District of Lancaster. In the spring of 1835, he was ordained by the Presbytery of Bethel to the full office of the Christian ministry, and was installed pastor of the associated churches of Waxhaw, Six Mile Creek, and Lancasterville. In the following December he formed a matrimonial alliance with a daughter of Colonel James H. Witherspoon, of Lancaster; the bonds of which were only dissolved, after the lapse of twenty-seven years, by his decease, leaving his widow and children to embitter their grief by the constant memory of his own exceeding goodness. In this pastoral charge he remained three years, from the commencement of 1835 to the close of 1837; and the brilliancy of his pulpit efforts, with the powerful impression produced upon his hearers, remains among the traditions of that region to this day, uneffaced by the labors of succeeding ministers. Indeed, in the

opinion of some, for popular effect those early discourses were never exceeded by the riper productions of his later years. Though his learning became more various, and his discussions more profound, yet the first impressions of his oratory were never transcended. Perhaps, however, this is due to a severer taste and a deeper Christian experience, which learned to disregard those mere graces of rhetoric by which a popular assembly is so often dazzled. We shall have occasion hereafter to describe him more fully as a preacher; and will discover that his eloquence dug for itself a deeper channel than in his earlier years, and poured itself in a much broader flood, rather overwhelming by its majesty than simply charming by its grace.

We now follow him to a different sphere. The chair of Logic and Criticism in the South Carolina College being made vacant by the death of the lamented Nott, the remembrance of his brilliant scholastic career, and the splendid fame he had acquired through the northern portion of the State, brought him before the electors as the man for the place. He was accordingly chosen to the vacant chair in December, 1837, which he soon occupied, the department being shortly after enlarged by the addition of Metaphysics. He entered with characteristic zeal upon the office of instruction, in studies so peculiarly adapted to his acute and analytical mind. Metaphysical science he speedily vindicated from the charge of inutility, showing the application of its principles to the practical business of life, and as implicitly involved in the whole current of human intercourse. His lucid exposition dispelled the haze of uncertainty and doubt hanging around themes so abstract and difficult of research. The warmth of his enthusiasm quickened into life and clothed with flesh the marrowless bones of what was regarded only as a dead philosophy. The reanimated form, instinct with the beauty which his glowing fancy diffused, invested with the drapery which his varied learning supplied, and speaking in the magnificent diction

which his matchless eloquence inspired, no longer repelled the embrace of ardent scholars, as when she lay a ghastly skeleton, covered with the dust of centuries of barren speculation. During his long connexion with the college she sat enthroned among the sciences, and far be the day when she shall be deposed from this queenly ascendency! But congenial as were these pursuits to the young professor, his conscience began to be disturbed with scruples which robbed his repose. We have already seen with what unusual solemnity and depth of conviction he assumed the office of the holy ministry. His ordination vow presses hard upon him. He had covenanted to make the proclamation of God's grace to sinners the business of his life. Did this comport with a life spent in teaching others only the endless see-saw of the syllogism, or even the sublimer mysteries of the human mind? The opportunities afforded for the occasional ministration of the Word, how frequent so ever, did not seem to fill up the measure of obligation he had contracted by "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." He must preach, with constancy and system, as a man plying his vocation: "the word of the Lord was in his heart, as a burning fire shut up in his bones, and he was weary with forbearing." Under this pressure of conscience, he proffered his resignation to the Board of Trustees in May, 1839, with a view to accept the pastorate of the Presbyterian church in Columbia, South Carolina. The transfer was effected at the close of the year, and on January 1, 1840, he was installed by the Presbytery of Charleston in this new relation. His services, however, to the college were too invaluable to induce general acquiescence in the change. An opportunity was soon presented for his recall. The election of the Rev. Dr. Elliott as Bishop of the Diocese of Georgia, left the college pulpit without an occupant. The chaplaincy was at once tendered him, in connexion with the Professorship of Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity. The conscientious scru-

ples which had withdrawn him from the chair of Philosophy did not embarrass his acceptance of a new position, where he would be intrusted with the care of souls, and those of a most important class in society. At the opening of the year 1841, he entered upon his duties in the college amidst the lamentation and tears of his deserted charge, who during one year had drunk the Gospel at his lips as never before. In this renewed connexion he remained through ten years, with almost unbroken repose; except that in the first of these years he was seriously threatened with a pulmonary affection, which interrupted his labors, and necessitated a visit of several months to Europe. During this time, he not only reëstablished his health, but came into acquaintance with many of the leading minds in England and Scotland; which, leading to a call for his published writings as fast as they afterward appeared, secured him a reputation in Europe as enviable, though not so wide, as that he enjoyed in America. Upon his return, his studies were resumed with redoubled vigor, rendered all the more valuable to himself from the necessity of daily imparting his knowledge to others: for true it is, in the language of the poet,

> "No man is the lord of any thing,
> Though in and of him there be much consisting,
> Till he communicate his parts to others—
> Nor doth he of himself know them for aught,
> Till he behold them formed in the applause
> Where they're extended; which, like an arch, reverberates
> The voice again; or, like a gate of steel,
> Fronting the sun, receives and renders back
> His figure and his heat."

The chair which he now held combined in its embrace the mysteries both of philosophy and revelation. Studies so lofty, and yet so comprehensive, pursued through ten years under the stimulus and in the daily reflection of his own teaching, deepened incredibly the bed of his mind, and laid up in its chambers stores of knowledge which made him rich for eternity. The prestige of his genius and his facility

of exposition rendered him the idol of his pupils: the tact he displayed in discipline, and the practical wisdom of all his suggestions on the subject of education, won more and more the admiration and confidence of the State; while the sanctification of all his powers to the glory of the Redeemer and the salvation of souls, knit to him the affections of the Church of God. The results of his long ministry in the college chapel will be known only at the judgment. Many received here their first saving impressions of divine truth, which, in after years, and under other ministrations, ripened in a sound conversion; and not a few seals to his fidelity were more immediately gathered into his crown. In that day of revelation, when all the issues of time shall be gathered into a single view, he will be greeted as a spiritual father by many sons whom he has begotten in the Gospel. Nor, in framing an estimate of the labors of this period, should we overlook the influence of his scientific and elaborate defences of the Christian faith, uttered in the class-room; by which many were saved from the delusions of infidelity, and rooted in at least a speculative belief in the word of God. Let us pause here and adore the mystery of that providence which worketh not after the pattern of human expectation. Who, that ten years before mourned over the college as the seat of infidelity, and sending out its reproach against God through all the land, dreamed that then she was nourishing in her bosom a champion for the truth, who should take up the gage and bear off the prize upon his triumphant lance! Who, that ten years before saw a half-grown youth sitting at the feet of the great apostle of deism, and drinking in his counsels as the inspirations of an oracle, foresaw the advocate for Christianity standing for its defence upon the very platform of its evidences, and undoing the work of his own oracle and guide! Who could then have foretold that an infidel philosophy was whetting the dialectics which should unravel its own sophisms, and feathering the arrow

by which its own life should be pierced: that deism itself should train the giant strength by which its own castle should be demolished, and the spell of its own foul enchantment be dissolved! Ah, it is the young Saxon monk, climbing Pilate's stair-case upon his knees, who now shakes the gates of papal Rome! It is the young man bearing the garments of the first martyr and consenting to his death, who now fills the world with the faith he destroyed!

In May, 1851, he was released from the college, and removed to the city of Charleston, on the acceptance of a call from the Glebe Street church. But before these arrangements were consummated, he was unexpectedly remanded to his old relations. The resignation of the presidency of the college by the Hon. William C. Preston turned the eyes of the whole State to the only man who was deemed worthy to be his successor; and now, the third time, the State became a suitor for his services; and a third time, by the unanimous voice of her whole constituency, he was borne into the academic halls with which his whole life had been so strangely identified. It was no small tribute paid to his merit, that he should be summoned to fill a station which, from the foundation of the college, had been graced by the most illustrious names. The unanimity of the summons was but a mark of appreciation which his great genius might justly claim as its due. For the office itself he had a surpassing fitness. His long experience in the government of young men; the exquisite tact he had so frequently displayed in times of emergency; the freshness of his sympathies, which bound him to them by cords whose tenderness was only equal to their strength; the complete ascendency he had acquired over them, not less by the force of his character than by the brilliancy of his intellect; the confidence in his integrity inspired by the transparent honesty of his heart; the affectionate reverence in which he was held by his colleagues in the faculty; and the cordial support he might expect to receive from a confiding public,

who trusted him with an unbounded faith: all gave the presage of a most successful administration. In January, 1852, he put on the mantle once worn by a Maxcy, a Barnwell, and a Preston; by a redistribution of the chairs, resuming his position as Chaplain and as Professor of the Evidences and of Moral Philosophy. We do not care to interrupt the continuity of his personal history with dissertations upon the several aspects of his character which these several relations reveal to us. Reserving these to another place, let us trace the thread of his life until it is broken at the grave. From the hints already given, the presidency of Dr. Thornwell would not probably be marked by much that is external. The college would be expected rather to move forward upon its wheels through its daily routine, without those jars and discords which, like revolutions in the State, denote something out of joint, through the unskilfulness of rulers. The same clear expositions of divine truth, and the same passionate appeals to the conscience, were heard, as before, every Sabbath, in the chapel; the same powerful vindication of the Christian faith, and the same luminous tracing of analogies between the natural and the moral government of God, were heard in the class-room, as before. But what large plans that fertile brain was maturing, to draw up the whole education of the land to a higher summit level; what modifications of the curriculum of study to secure greater mental discipline, and yet to enlarge the culture and extend the area of knowledge—all this, which might have wrought itself out in the history of the institution which he loved, was arrested by a movement which plucked him from his seat, and terminated for ever his connexion with the college.

In the zenith of his fame, in the height of his influence, with statesmen and judges clustering around him, with a large retinue of admiring pupils, himself the pivot upon which turned the educational interests of his native State—covered with academic titles, and clothed with the highest

academic office in his country's gift—is there yet a nobler reward, a richer meed of praise, to be lavished upon this favored son of learning? There remains but one, and that must come from the Church of God. As intimated by her Founder and Head, "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" and her rewards may seem paltry to the eye of sense, when hung in contrast with the splendid prizes of earthly distinction. Yet the call upon this man by the Redeemer's Church, to turn from these academic titles and train her sons for the ministry of reconciliation, was the crowning glory of a life bright with applause from its beginning. Through eighteen years the Church, holding in her hands his pledge of allegiance, had lent him to the State; through eighteen years he had devoted himself to its most vital interest, with an assiduity of which only an earnest soul was capable. Now, in the noon of his life, in the ripeness of his intellect, and in the richness of his learning, the Church saw fit to reclaim him to herself; she would pass those rare gifts under the baptism of a renewed consecration to her service. It was thought by some a waste to fritter the energies of such a mind in the mere police requisite for the government of undergraduates, or in the details of an executive office, however honorable. It was feared by others that his frail constitution would succumb beneath the anxiety and care continually exacting upon a frame already taxed to its utmost endurance by the habits of a student. It was felt by all that if the Church of this generation must swell the wisdom of the past by a contribution of its own, this was the representative of her choice, whose immortal writings should teach to children's children the piety and faith of their fathers. Dr. Thornwell had evinced singular aptitude in repelling the false philosophy of the day in its covert assaults upon the word of God. Holding in his grasp the entire history of philosophy, from the times of Plato and Aristotle to those of Fichte and of Kant; possessing a logic that could detect and tear off the dis-

guises of error; and withal, imbued with profoundest reverence for the dogmatic authority of Scripture: such a man could, of all others, unmask the hypocritical rationalism which seeks by craft to undermine our faith in an objective revelation, and borrows the very dialect of the Gospel to travestie its holiest and most vital truths. Such a man, it was hoped, might not only tone the rising ministry of the Church, and fashion them in part upon his own majestic mould; but would reproduce the fixed theology of the past in its new relations to the present. For, as the mountain which leans its ragged head against the sky, itself the same for ever, is differently seen through the shifting atmosphere which surrounds it; so the theology of the Bible, eternal as the being and government of God, is affected by the shifting hues of the philosophic medium through which it is seen and interpreted. It was the highest mark of the Church's favor to Dr. Thornwell, that he was chosen for the momentous task: and that he might have leisure for its accomplishment, the Church withdrew him from the garish splendor of the world within her own tranquil shades, and hoped and prayed to her great Head to spare him till the work was done. Three things the Church expected at his hands, and then she would freely yield him to the enjoyment of his reward on high: a system of theology from his own point of view, exhibiting the nexus between all its parts, and blending these in a perfect unity; a rediscussion of the Christian Evidences, with reference to the subtle, rationalistic philosophy by which they have been impugned; and a book on morals, in which the foundation of the true philosophy of human obligation should be laid bare. The materials for all three were abundantly treasured in the store-house of his thought: nothing remained but to draw them forth and commit them to the record! Alas! death came too soon for the Church to realize the rich legacy her heart was coveting. Only a part of the first in this triplet was permitted to be

done: all else has gone down into the silence of his tomb, from which comes no response to our wail of sorrow.

In December, 1855, he pronounced his fourth and last baccalaureate; and, obedient to the call of the two synods of South Carolina and Georgia, turned his back upon the halls in which he had so long taught the sons of the State, and entered the school of the prophets, hard by, to train the sons of the Church for their mission of love to a dying world. Dr. Thornwell, with all his various learning, eminently illustrated the adage, "Beware of the man of one book." In his own search after truth, whilst he read in a good degree discursively, he *studied* a few great masters. Plato and Aristotle among the ancients—Milton, Locke, and Bacon among the moderns, he read and re-read; until he not only digested their contents, but was saturated with their spirit, and stood prepared to grapple independently with the highest problems of human existence. The same policy marked his course as a teacher. The text-book by which he disciplined his college pupils into habits of severe thinking, was the celebrated Analogy of Bishop Butler, which, undisfigured by the pedantry of foot-notes, shows in the text itself a perfect mastery of the entire literature of the subject. But whatever text-book was chosen by Dr. Thornwell, it served only as a thread upon which to string the pearls of knowledge he had himself collected. A college student once remarked to the speaker: "Dr. Thornwell is the only teacher for whose recitation I can never say I am fully prepared; I study Butler until I can repeat every word, and fancy that I can answer every possible question, and in three minutes I stand before him a perfect fool, and feel that I know nothing at all. He has, sir, the happiest knack of drawing out of Butler what was never there, except as he put it in." The teacher knew—the pupil did not—how deep those simple and suggestive sentences of the author actually drew: only an equal mind could take the soundings of such a work. The selection of a text-

book in theology was typical of the man; it was the Institutes of John Calvin. Wonderful association of names! drawn together by an electric affinity so close that, with the men transposed, the Calvin three centuries back might have been the Thornwell of to-day, and our Thornwell might equally have been the Calvin of the Reformation. The same profoundness of learning, evincing itself rather in the results it achieves than in the idle display of the apparatus with which it works; the same logical acumen, which resolved the most intricate problems and laid bare the secret principles wrapped within their folds; the same massive intellect, which imbedded these in pregnant utterances capable of endless exposition; the same candor in the investigation of truth, and the same passionate love which made them worshippers at her shrine; the same Herculean industry, which sported with labor and found refreshment in toils by which others were exhausted; the same practical judgment, whose counsels were almost akin to prophecy, and seldom led astray those who asked advice; the same versatility of genius, which made the ecclesiastic an able counsellor of State; the same simplicity of character, which preserved the freshness of childhood in the maturity of age; the same fearlessness of soul, which shrank neither from reproach nor peril in the pursuit of right; the same guileless sincerity, which never understood *finesse* nor worked by indirection: all these and other traits run the parallel so close between the two that, standing three centuries apart, they seem to be born twins. The resemblance is preserved even in things we would call accidental. The same early maturity of mind, which enabled the one, at the age of twenty-five, to dedicate his Institutes to the French king, and which placed the other, at the same age, in the chair of Philosophy; the possession by both of a frail body, which scarcely contained the indwelling spirit, beating against its sides with every movement of its own activity, and threatening each day to batter down the walls

of its feeble prison; and finally, the coincidence in their death at nearly the same age, the one in his fifty-fifth, and the other in his fiftieth year, both closing a long life while it was yet high noon with both; these are points of resemblance which, though accidental, we can not but pause to admire. Nor is it strange that the theologian of the nineteenth century should go back to the theologian of the sixteenth, to find a master for his pupils. He who had dug the truth for himself from the quarry of the Scriptures, and from the symbols of the Church, would naturally carry his pupils up the stream of theological tradition to the very spot where it broke out afresh from the earth. Like the fabled river of Africa, systematic theology had for ages buried its channel beneath the superstitions and errors of popery; and, as from the foot of a great mountain, it emerged anew at the period of the Reformation. Precisely here the waters would be found the purest, except as he might carry his pupils higher still, to the original fountain, and cause them to drink from the oracles of God. But when it became necessary to employ human aid in constructing an articulate system of doctrine, he found no master equal to the great theologian of the Reformation. John Calvin stands in the same relation to Protestant theology as Francis Bacon to modern philosophy; each being a constructor in his own sphere, and each putting the stamp of his own thought upon the science of after times. Nay, if it be not irreverent thus to couple inspired with uninspired names, John Calvin stands in the college of the Reformers somewhat as Paul in the college of the Apostles, the penman and logician of his day. After the lapse of three centuries, he finds an expositor worthy of himself—the Plato after Socrates. Happy master, to find such a commentator! Happy expositor, to find such a master! Happy pupils, to sit under the combined light of two such kindred intellects!

Dr. Thornwell's method of instruction was the Socratic. He examined his class upon the text of the author, so

shaping his interrogatories as to evolve the truth from the mind of the student itself. Recitation by rote was an impossibility; the repetition of the text did not answer the requisitions of the class-room. Interrogation was poured upon the pupil's head like a shower of hail, until he was driven back through all the steps of the most rigorous analysis; then he must frame precise statements of the doctrine, while a critical logic stood by to cut and pare until it was revealed before the eye with the utmost sharpness of profile. Finally, the student was put upon his defence, against every form of assault to which the champion for the truth might be exposed. If the line of defence was unskilful, the pupil found himself in the toils of an adversary who wound tightly about him the meshes in which he was involved. Not till then came the hour of extrication. But at last there would follow lucid exposition, searching analysis, and resistless logic, disentangling the web and probing every difficulty to its core. The class-room was thus not like the studio of the statuary, who chips away upon the senseless block until he "moulds every joint and member into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection;" but it was the gymnasium, where the living mind was taught to unfold itself according to its own law of developement, and work itself out into the consciousness of knowledge which is yet a part of its own texture. He is a benefactor who communicates to me one new and grand thought; but he is twice a benefactor who helps me to think that thought myself. Under this double weight of gratitude Dr. Thornwell brought his pupils; no wonder that they loved him as a child its father! Bereaved school of the prophets, well may thy walls be draped in mourning! During the life of this generation, thy sons will mourn the loss of instruction which can not be reproduced; but which a faithful tradition will hand down, so long as one shall live that ever saw the kindling of his expressive eye.

Besides his labors as a theological professor, he discharged once more the duties of a pastor in the Columbia church; over which he was a second time installed, in conjunction with a younger brother, one of his own pupils, upon whom the sole pastorship was finally devolved. During the past two years, his constitution, naturally frail, manifested symptoms of sure but gradual decay. Severe application to study such as his, protracted through so many years, must tell upon the physical frame, so soon as its recuperative energies begin to be impaired. His nervous system commenced now giving way, and he experienced that prostration of strength more distressing than even acute suffering. Coupled with this, the fears of pulmonary disease, which had been excited in his earlier life, were now renewed. In consequence of this two-fold affection, he made, in 1860, a second trip across the Atlantic, and returned improved, but not, as before, renovated. Unquestionably, too, the intense excitement of the present war wore upon his shattered and nervous body, beyond its power either to sustain or resist. The love of country burned always in his breast at a white heat. In former years none gloried more than he in the spreading power of the old Republic, and his sanguine hope painted her future splendor in colors absolutely gorgeous. The speaker well remembers, three years ago, the spontaneous burst of applause in the General Assembly, so unusual in an ecclesiastical council, produced by one of his sudden outbreaks of patriotic fervor. He was describing his emotions while surveying in the Tower of London the various trophies of British prowess; and how he drew himself up to his highest stature, and proudly said to his attendants, "Your country has waged two long wars against mine, but I see here no trophies of successful valor wrested from American hands." But those were days when America had not learned to bow the supple knee before a vulgar despotism of her own creation; the slime of the serpent's trail had not then been seen winding

around the steep ascent to the presidential chair. From the moment a sectional party obtained the supreme control, his clear judgment saw at a glance the momentous issue that must be joined. His heart turned at once to his beloved South, as all the country that was left to him, in whose entire independence rested the last hope of republican freedom. His patriotism burst forth into a consuming passion, and his cultivated moral sense looked upon his country's wrongs with a resentment which was holy. From the pulpit and the platform he poured forth his fiery eloquence, in words scarcely less massive than those hurled by Demosthenes against the Macedonian Philip. In elaborate essays, he unfolded, with a statesman's power, the mighty principles of religious and political liberty which were implicated in the struggle; and through the newspaper press his prophetic words were borne upon the wind, like the leaves of the Sybil, through the whole Confederacy. These writings will be gathered into the portfolio of the statesman, as among the ablest documents of the time. They reveal the order of statesmanship he would have attained, if he had chosen to walk in the paths of political preferment; and those who may have regretted his turning aside from these, may take comfort in the thought that even thus, when life was flickering in its socket, he fulfilled a statesman's task, and left behind him a statesman's fame; for at this moment South Carolina weeps at his grave such tears as she learned to shed around the bier of her immortal Calhoun.

As usual, Dr. Thornwell spent his last vacation in the vain effort to recruit his health, visiting for this purpose Wilson's springs, in North Carolina. But experiencing no benefit from their waters, he came down to Charlotte, to meet his wife and son; the latter of whom, after recovering from severe wounds received in battle, was on his way to the theatre of war in Virginia. Here his disease, a chronic dysentery, returned upon him with redoubled violence; and

after a short conflict with the powers of nature, overthrew its victim, and bore him to the tomb. Through this last sickness he was not permitted to speak much. Apart from his characteristic reserve, which shrunk from every thing approaching a scene, the nature of his malady was such as to becloud his mind. He lay, for the most part, in stupor; easily aroused, indeed, to the recognition of those about his bed, but speedily sinking back into lethargy. His troubled and incoherent utterances revealed the habit of his life: lifting his finger, as if addressing an imaginary class, he would say, "Well, you have stated your position, now prove it;" and then, as if musing upon the qualities of the human mind, he would articulate: "The attributes—first, the moral, then the intellectual, and thirdly, the religious or spiritual;" reminding us of the good Neander, who, in like manner, would lift himself from his dying couch and say, "To-morrow, young gentlemen, we will resume our exercitations upon the sixth chapter of John." It is our loss that we can not treasure the last sayings of such a master, for

> "The tongues of dying men
> Enforce attention, like deep harmony;
> The setting sun, and music at the close,
> As the last taste of sweets, is sweetest last,
> Writ in remembrance more than things long past."

Yet they are not needed; our brother's whole life was a continued song: and memory, with her faithful chord, like an Æolian harp, will prolong its music till we, too, sleep. On the first day of August, 1862, he entered gently into the rest of God. Six years ago, the last time but one it was the speaker's privilege to hear him from the pulpit, in one of those outbursts of strong emotion which we all remember, he exclaimed: "I am often very weary—weary with work, as the feeble body reels beneath its accumulated toils; weary in struggling with my own distrustful and unbelieving heart; weary with the wickedness of men, and with

the effort to put a bridle upon human passions, and I often sigh to be at rest"! Brother! thou hast entered into rest, and we are the more weary for loss of thee!

The thread is broken which has conducted us from the cradle to the grave: in what manner it has been gathered up by unseen hands, and woven into a broader and brighter web beyond the skies, it is not for us yet to know. The foregoing sketch presents only the connexions of his earthly history, and the facts which afford a key to the consummate excellence he achieved. A complete memoir would swell this discourse into the proportions of a book, and it is reserved, we trust, for some future day and for some abler hand. It only now remains to consider the relations in which he stood to society, and to analyze the powers which in their combination produced the genius we have so long admired.

Every attribute of his mind, natural and acquired, fitted him to be the EDUCATOR OF YOUTH, in which relation he stood so long prominently before the public eye. The range of his learning was immense. Though he studied severely certain great masters, his reading was discursive and large: and such was his power of concentration, that he seemed to take up knowledge by absorption. It was playfully said of the learned Murdock, the American Commentator of Mosheim, that he never could have amassed such intellectual stores unless his two great eyes read both pages of a book at once. The secret lay in that rare discipline by which the attention was riveted, and knowledge was immediately assimilated. Dr. Thornwell possessed this faculty in the highest degree. His mind was under such control that, when closeted with an author, the door was locked against all intrusive thoughts, and he digested as soon as he devoured. His retentive memory, also, never relaxed its hold of what was once read. We have heard him recite consecutive pages of Milton's Paradise Lost, as

though the whole poem was daguerreotyped upon the tablet of his memory; and, more wonderful still, entire odes of Horace, when it was certain the original had not been opened for years. Without the aid of an index, or any artificial digest, he could refer to volume and page of any author he had once perused. His memory could not only reproduce the logical contents of a book, but the precise language of many extended passages which most impressed him. Besides the studies which he had made his specialty, he excelled in other branches of universal knowledge. He was a ripe classical scholar: Latin he could write correctly and with ease, and in Greek he was singularly proficient. The works of Aristotle lay always upon his table, and he revelled in the philosophy and poetry of Plato. The group of scholars who would sometimes with him pour over the pages of the Phædo, knew not which most to admire, the exquisite finish of his translation, or his philosophic commentary on the text. The study of Hebrew he had never carried to any remarkable extent, but his knowlege was sufficient for the purposes of a careful exegesis. French and German he had mastered so far as to put him in living communion with the literature of both languages, and only required larger practice to render them the medium of conversational intercourse. To the study of mathematics he had no original bias, and probably never pushed his knowledge beyond the point to which a liberal college curriculum conducted him. He certainly sympathized in the views of Sir William Hamilton upon their precise value as a method of intellectual discipline, and the place they should occupy in a course of general education. In belles-lettres he was far from being deficient. He had read the beautiful classics of his own and other tongues, and was by no means insensible to the charms of poetry and song. But his severer order of mind led him through more thorny paths; and his ardent search after absolute and unadorned truth left him little leisure to cull the beauties which grow

in the flower-beds of the Muses. But when it pleased him, he could select a beautiful bouquet from the garden of English literature, and his own affluent diction was tinged with its inimitable sweetness and grace. Indeed, the exquisiteness of his literary taste was a serious impediment with him to authorship. Fastidious as to style, he conceived disgust for his own writings as soon as he departed from that region of argumentative and didactic philosophy where he was so completely at home; and upon this ground resisted the importunities of friends who were continually urging him to write. He lived to overcome and to regret this fastidiousness, but too late for the world to recover what it has thus lost for ever. In history, both ancient and modern, of the Church and of the State, he was extensively and accurately read; and could enforce argument by many an apposite appeal to the recorded experience of mankind; and no one generalized more safely the practical conclusions which should be drawn from its universal teachings. In natural science he had never carried his researches through the many departments in which it is now subdivided. His information was not, therefore, minute: but his general knowledge was accurate and full, and he sometimes adorned his discourse with beautiful illustrations drawn from the analogies of the material world. He has been accused of disparaging the natural sciences as a part of liberal education, in which we suppose there is a slight misapprehension of his true position. He certainly did not estimate them highly as instruments of mental discipline, and thus assigned them a small place in that scheme of education which is intended to discipline and train the mind. But he would give them ample verge in that broader scheme, which takes the disciplined mind and adorns it with various knowledge: he simply shifted their position from the gymnasium to the university, and would rejoice in their cultivation as the furniture, rather than as the diet, of the mind.

The accuracy of his knowledge was even more wonderful than its extent. We say deliberately, and exactly what the words imply, that we have never known a man who made his knowledge so peculiarly his own. It was not learning codified in common-place books, nor locked up in pigeon-holes nicely labelled and tied up up with red tape, to be drawn forth from dust and brown paper when wanted, but it was part and parcel of his own mental substance. Whenever reproduced, it came fresh from his own mint, stamped with the coinage of his own thought. It did not simply strain through his memory, like water through a sieve, but it entered into the bone, and flesh, and blood of his own thinking. Hence, he was never overborne by it, as too many are, nor did it impair the individuality and freshness of his mind. When he wrote and spoke, the stream flowed forth with an even fulness, under the pressure of its own abundance. All this entered into his merit as an instructor. The variety and depth of his learning invested him with the highest authority; while his perfect command over it, enabled him to present truth under any form level to the student's apprehension. He had the most remarkable facility of explanation; his thoughts ran in no stereotyped phrases, but could be cast into a hundred moulds, suited to a hundred different minds. The strongest sympathy, too, was established between the teacher and his pupils. He never wrapped himself up in an artificial dignity, but won all who approached him by the genial kindness of his temper, and by the childlike simplicity of his address. Even under the severe inquisitions of the class-room, the pupil felt that his teacher was his friend, and would be his helper in the painful search for knowledge; while in private, the great man let himself down into the playfulness of a child, and chased timidity away by the unceasing flow of humor and sportive wit. Thoroughly digesting his own knowledge, be became, as we have seen, a perfect master of the Socratic method of

instruction, so difficult except in the hands of a master. Teaching his pupils to search for ultimate principles, he taught them the happy art of generalization, which is, after all, the true secret of large mental acquisitions; for these ascertained principles not only afford the nucleus around which the most diffuse reading may collect itself, but give the key by which the secret stores may be unlocked and brought into use. He could not, therefore, but excel as an instructor in those branches which he particularly taught.

For similar reasons, he was equally fitted to represent and conduct the general interests of education through the State at large. Upon this entire subject his views were strongly defined. He properly considered the discipline of the mind to be the first object of education; to elicit its dormant powers, and to train these for vigorous self-action; while the mere acquisition of knowledge he regarded as secondary in time and importance. He therefore disapproved the attempt made in our American colleges, to cover the whole area of science, and to compass within a four years' course, peculiar and professional studies. His favorite idea was to restrict undergraduates to studies by which the mind may be systematically developed, and to engraft upon the college, at the close of a prescribed and compulsory curriculum, the main features of the university system, with its large and varied apparatus for the fuller communication of knowledge. He was a warm advocate for common school education among the masses; yet firmly held to the idea that knowledge, after all, is diffused by its own law of descent from above, below; percolating through society from the surface to the lowest bed beneath. Hence he labored with all his energy to promote the highest education among the few, as the surest way to quicken and enlighten the less favored masses. Thoroughly imbued with the Aristotelian maxim, *Πολις γινομενη μεν του ζην ενεκεν, ουσα δε του ευ ζην*, he reckoned it amongst the highest obligations of the State to provide for the education of her sons. Upon this ground, and to

prevent collision between the two jurisdictions, he resisted through life the doctrine which places secular education among the positive duties of the Church. In her organized capacity, according to his strict construction of her charter, her duty terminates with the religious training of mankind—the sanctuary, her class-room; the pulpit, her chair; and the Gospel of Jesus, her discipline. It is not the historian's province to arbitrate in such a controversy; but only to represent opinions firmly held by the subject of his story. He found able critics upon either hand—those who upheld in this matter the prerogative of the Church; and those who as stoutly denied his postulate touching the duty of the State. It is hard to swim against the current of the age. His grand ideal of an institution which should unite the advantages of the gymnasium with those of the university, was never realized; and he has left the great problem of education yet to be solved—how to adjust the wide diffusion of knowledge with that breadth and depth of learning which it was the object of his life to secure. But, whoever may have differed from him on these points, none ever questioned the sincerity of his convictions, doubted the purity of his motives, or denied the impulse which the cause of education received at his hands—an impulse chiefly due to the personal influence which has given tone to so many yet living, through whom it will be perpetuated to generations yet to come.

We shall be pardoned for combining next the PHILOSOPHER and the THEOLOGIAN; not only because of the natural affinity between the two, but because of their actual conjunction in the history and labors of Dr. Thornwell. In them we have the ripest fruits of his genius, and upon these two pillars the whole of his future fame must rest. We have seen that his mind was early biased towards philosophy—it would probably have been determined in this direction by its inherent proclivity. The culture through which it subsequently passed, places him without

a peer in this department. After the splendid eulogium which he has pronounced upon Sir William Hamilton—"in depth and acuteness of mind a rival of Aristotle, in immensity of learning a match for Leibnitz, in comprehensiveness of thought an equal to Bacon"—it may seem a perilous connexion to mention the name of the impassioned paneygyrist himself. But truth demands the utterance of the conviction that, after Hamilton, no mind was more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of philosophy than his. It is unfortunate that, aside from the aroma which breathes through all his writings, the evidence of his splendid acquisitions can be gathered only from monographs; and those upon topics which rather implicate philosophy than lie wholly within its domain. He was unquestionably master of its history, from its dawn amidst the schools of Greece, through the mid-day slumbers in which it dozed with the Schoolmen, to the frenzied and fantastic dreams of our modern transcendentalists. Passing through all the schools into which her followers have been divided, and acquainted with every shade of opinion by which they are distinguished, the fan of his own criticism winnowed the chaff from the wheat; and whatever contribution each school or age may have made to her common stores, he safely gathered into the chambers of his memory.

The traits which specially characterized his own speculations were, modesty and earnestness in the discovery of positive truth. His first effort was to mark the boundaries of reason; within whose limits he thought with all the vigor and self-reliance characteristic of a mind conscious of its own great powers, and beyond which he never permitted himself to pass. He was thus protected from that presumptuous rationalism which so much disfigures the thinking of modern Germany; and uttered his frequent and solemn protests against the profaneness of those "rampant ontologists," who attempt to "unfold the grounds of universal being from the principles of pure reason." His mind was

too positive in its tone to rest on theories, however splendid, unless he could discover a solid basis upon which to build them. It was not content simply with beating the air with its wings, however high it might soar; nor did he ever mistake the fantastic scenery of the clouds for the mountain landscape of which he was in search. Taking his departure from the English and Scotch schools, that all our knowledge begins in experience, he concurred with these in the doctrine of fundamental beliefs as essential to experience, and by which alone it is made available. He struck thus a middle course between the doctrine which makes the mind only a passive recipient of impressions, working up the materials it gathers from without, and the antagonist view which finds in the mind itself the data of all knowledge, "of which universal and all-comprehensive principles the reason is held to be the complement." He was able thus to steer safely between the Scylla and Charibdis of philosophy; between the Atheistic materialism of the French Encyclopedists on the one hand, and the pantheistic audacity of the German rationalists upon the other. His consistent and intelligible doctrine held that, while knowledge begins in experience, yet "experience must include conditions in the subject which make it capable of intelligence." "There must be," he says, "a *constitution* of mind adapted to that specific activity by which it believes and judges." The mind is, therefore, "subjected to laws of belief under which it must necessarily act"—"certain primary truths involved in its very structure." As "undeveloped in experience, these do not exist in the form of propositions or general conceptions, but of irresistible *tendencies* to certain manners of belief, when the proper occasions shall be afforded." But "when developed in experience, and generalized into abstract statements, they are original and elementary cognitions, the foundation and criterion of all knowledge." While, however, "the laws of belief qualify the subject to know, they can not give the things to be known. These are fur-

nished in experience, which thus not only affords the occasions on which our primitive cognitions are developed, but also the objects about which our faculties are conversant." Starting from these principles, it is easy to see that the same reform is carried into mental philosophy, which long since has been achieved in the natural or physical. The knowledge acquired is substantive and real; because it is a knowledge only of attributes and properties, level to our apprehension, capable of being gathered by observation, and of being generalized by induction. The mind, instead of being lost in speculations which transcend its limits, settles with confidence upon those positive truths which it is able continually to verify. But it would be idle to map out, in this connexion, the whole scheme of philosophy wrought out by Dr. Thornwell through the studies of a long life. Thus much has been said to indicate the position which he occupied, searching only for the positive and the real in all his researches. His mind, from its modesty and earnestness united, speculated safely. Feeling the ground beneath his feet at every step, with fixed principles for his guidance, he wrought within this broad field of observation and induction, in the language of one who has described him, with "an acuteness of mind that was marvellous, with a quickness of apprehension and rapidity of thought never surpassed, and with a power of analysis which, as if by the touch of the magician, resolved the most complex objects into its simple elements."

Dr. Thornwell's studies in philosophy were not lost upon him as a theologian: if he sought diligently to ascertain the bounds of reason in the one, he was not likely to transcend them in the other. Penetrated with the conviction that God can be known only so far as He has been pleased to reveal Himself, he bowed with perfect docility before the dogmatic authority of the Scriptures. In this he signalized at once the modesty of the philosopher and the humility of the Christian. He brought all his speculations to this touch-

stone; and wherever he found a "thus saith the Lord," he ceased to reason and began to worship. He first sought, by a most careful exegesis, to ascertain the meaning of God's word; then to collate and classify, until he built up a systematic theology. As the inductive philosopher ranges through nature, collects his facts, and builds up his science; so the theologian ranges up and down the inspired record, collects its doctrines as they are strewn in magnificent profusion through the histories, narratives, poems, epistles, and predictions of the Bible, and in the same spirit of caution constructs his scheme of divinity. The system deduced by our brother from this venerable and authoritative testimony, was precisely that articulately set forth in the Westminster Confession. It was, in his view, the only complete system of truth which a thorough and candid exposition could extract from the Bible. By many, doubtless, he has been regarded as extreme in some of his theological views; a prejudice founded, perhaps, upon the positive tone with which his convictions, like those of all earnest men, were announced, and the fervid zeal with which they were cherished and defended. Never was a prejudice more unfounded. His examination was too cautious, and his knowledge too exact, to allow extravagance in any single direction. His theology was uncommonly symmetrical in its proportions. He knew the limitations upon every single doctrine, and the relations of all in a common system, by which they are checked and qualified. There could be no overlapping; for every part was so sharply cut and defined, and the articulations were so close, that to a mind severely logical the whole must stand or fall together. We think it doubtful if a single instance can be produced, in all his writings or in his extemporaneous addresses, of that extravagance, even in language, which so shocks a pious ear, and by which the forcible-feeble amongst us often attempt to make the truth intense. Always earnest indeed, he was remarkably exact and logical in his statements of doctrine; cautious not to go

beyond the clear testimony of the written word, and careful never to disturb the harmony subsisting between the truths themselves, as constituent members of one entire system; and always relying upon the simple majesty of the truth to carry its own convictions to a loyal understanding. His discussions were exhaustive and profound, bringing all the light of philosophy to elucidate the principles of religion; which, as to their substance, could only be derived by a direct revelation from Jehovah himself.

We next turn to view Dr. Thornwell in THE PULPIT, an ambassador of God to sinful men. And here may be repeated of him what was said with so much emphasis of Ebenezer Erskine, that "he who never heard him, never heard the Gospel in its majesty." From all that has been said of his logical proclivity and scholastic training, it may be rightly inferred that his preaching was addressed predominantly to the understanding: we do not mean, of course, to the exclusion of the heart, as we shall presently see. But, looking upon man as a being of intelligence, and upon the truth as the instrument of sanctification, he caused that truth to knock at the gates of the understanding until she was admitted and entertained. He had a sublime faith in the majesty and power of truth, and in God's ordained method of reaching the affections through the proclamation of His word. Eschewing all efforts to work upon the superficial emotions, or to play upon natural sympathies, he addressed himself in earnest to present the whole truth of God, and to discuss its fundamental principles before men. His analytic power was richly displayed in the pulpit. The clear statement of a case is often one-half of an argument. Stripping his subject at once of all that was adventitious or collateral, he laid bare to the eye some single principle upon which it turned—so single and so bare, that the most untrained hearer was compelled to see precisely what was to be elucidated. Then followed a course of argument, close, logical, profound, and clear, bending forward

to one conclusion; towards which the hearer was carried, with his will or against it, led captive in chains of logic that could no where be broken. When the truth had won its way to the most acknowledged conviction, and the mind was broken down into a state of complete submission, the argument would be gathered up in its weighty and practical conclusions, and hurled upon the conscience; compelling either the confession of guilt upon the one hand, or the most complete stultification of reason on the other. These appeals to the heart were often fearful in their solemnity; and all the more, as being based upon the conviction of the understanding, previously gained. They were not simple exhortation; but a judicial finding in the court of the hearer's own conscience. The preacher stood there as an attorney from heaven, to indict and prosecute the sinner; the pleading has been heard, and the argument for his conviction is concluded; and the sinner hears only the sentence of conscience, from its throne of judgment, echoing through all the chambers of the soul. It was upon this plan most of the discourses of this matchless preacher were formed. It mattered little whether the exposition was of moral law or of Gospel grace; there was the same statement and enforcement of eternal and immutable principles, and the same judicial finding of guilt and shame, whether the form of offence was against the one or the other. We have described Dr. Thornwell as being predominantly argumentative. He was not, however, polemic. Indeed, the current of his argument was too rapid and vehement to pause and deal with impugners and their small objections. It was the rushing down of the Nile, swollen with its mountain tributaries, and bursting through the sedge which impedes its flow. He rightly judged that to build up truth in its positive form was the better way to remove difficulties, which in its light soon come to appear as mere impertinences.

Nor were his public efforts always thus exclusively argumentative. He excelled in the exposition of Scripture; and had he not chosen to be the first of logicians, he might have been the first of commentators. His analytical talent was brought richly into play. It dealt little in dry, verbal criticism; but, after a sufficient elucidation of the text, it seized the great principles which were involved, and marshalled them in their proper order—a species of commentary of which, with all his dogmatism, we have an excellent example in Haldane; and a form of exposition particularly useful to the general reader, as presenting the Scriptures in their logical connexion before the mind. His relations, moreover, for so long a time as preacher to young men, led him into much practical discourse upon the common duties of life; characterized still by the same clear exhibition of final principles which, either as determining the nature of morality or as affording specific rules for the conduct, revealed the strong thinker and the practical moralist.

But the feature most remarkable in this prince of pulpit orators was, the rare union of rigorous logic with strong emotion. He reasoned always, but never coldly. Most logicians present truth only in what Bacon calls "the dry light of the understanding;" clear indeed, but without the heat which warms and fructifies. The sun shines upon the polar iceberg, and its sheen glances from the polished surface as though it were the splendor of heaven; yet the brightness sickens the beholder, from the cheerless desolation which it every where reveals. Dr. Thornwell wove his argument in fire. His mind warmed with the friction of its own thoughts, and glowed under the rapidity of its own motion; and the speaker was borne along in what seemed to others a chariot of flame. One must have listened to him to form an adequate conception of what we mean. Penetrated with the sublimity of his theme, and feeling in the depths of his soul its transcendent importance, he could not preach the Gospel of the grace of God

with the freezing coldness of a philosopher. As the flood of his discourse set in, one could perceive the ground-swell from beneath, the heaving tide of passionate emotion which rolled it on. Kindling with a secret inspiration as he proceeded, his manner lost its slight constraint; all angularity of gesture and ungracefulness of posture suddenly disappeared; the spasmodic shaking of the head entirely ceased; his slender form dilated; his deep black eye lost its drooping expression; the soul came and looked forth, lighting it up with a strange, unearthly brilliancy; his frail body rocked and trembled as under a divine afflatus, as though the impatient soul would rend its tabernacle and fly forth to God and heaven upon the wings of his impassioned words; until his fiery eloquence, rising with the greatness of his conceptions, would burst upon the hearer in some grand climax, overwhelming in its majesty and resistless in its effect. In all this, as may be conceived, there was no declamation, no "histrionic mummery," no straining for effect, nothing approaching to rant. All was natural, the simple product of thought and feeling wonderfully combined. We saw the whirlwind as it rose and gathered up the waters of the sea; we saw it in its headlong course, and in the bursting of its power. However vehement his passion, it was justified by the massive thought which engendered it; and in all the storm of his eloquence, the genius of logic could be seen presiding over its elements, and guiding its course. The hearer had just that sense of power, which power gives when seen under a measure of restraint. The speaker's fulness was not exhausted; language only failed to convey what was left behind.

But this picture would be incomplete, if we failed to speak of the magnificent diction which formed the vesture of his noble thoughts. "It is," says one, "the plumage of the royal bird which bears him upward to the sun;" and Dr. Thornwell was far from being insensible to the power of language. In his early life, it was with him an affec-

tionate study; and in later years, it was his habit before any great public effort to tone his style by reading a few pages from some master in composition—sometimes it was a passage from Robert Hall, sometimes of Edward Gibbon, sometimes of Edmund Burke, sometimes of glorious old Milton; but oftener yet he drank from that old well of eloquence, Demosthenes for the Crown. His spoken style was unquestionably, however, the general result of his life's study. His habits of close thinking exacted a choice of words. We think in language, however unconscious we may be of the process. It is the only embodiment of thought, without which we can not represent it to ourselves. Style, therefore, is not so much cut and fitted to the thought by an artificial and secondary labor, as it is woven by the thought in the course of its own developement. Hence the precision which uniformly characterized Dr. Thornwell's style. He was, above other men, a close thinker; a thinker who had daily to think his thoughts aloud in the hearing of his pupils. The utmost exactness in language was required by the studies of his department. The subtle spirit of philosophy could only be held, as it was caught and imprisoned in the precise word which fitted it; and so his whole career as a teacher was a training for himself as a master in style. The classical studies which he pursued so diligently when young, and which were never remitted even to the close of his life, were a continued exposition of language; so that, in a thousand cases, you shall not find a ripe scholar who is not equally a finished writer. In addition to all, his copious reading opened to him the whole vocabulary of his native tongue. "Reading," says Lord Bacon, "makes a full man; writing, an exact man; and speaking, a ready man." Dr. Thornwell was all three, habitually, and through a long life. He read abundantly, and in all directions, and acquired insensibly that copiousness of language which formed one of the attributes of his style. But it was the union of precision with fulness which distinguished his

utterances. In the most rapid flow of his speech, his style was beyond impeachment. It was always the right word for the thought, and the whole vocabulary of language could not have furnished a substitute; while, in the amplification of his thought, his mind, like a kaleidoscope, presented an infinite variety of terms, and the same combination never palled by repetition. To this precision and copiousness was added a certain richness of expression, a courtliness of style; which can only be explained by the majesty of his thought, which disdained to appear in the dress of the clown.

To understand Dr. Thornwell's power in the pulpit, these several elements must be combined—his powerful logic, his passionate emotion, his majestic style—of which it may be said, as of Lord Brougham's, that "he wielded the club of Hercules entwined with roses." This generation will never look upon his like again; a single century can not afford to produce his equal. We shall listen to much lucid exposition, much close and powerful reasoning, much tender and earnest appeal, much beautiful and varied imagery. But never again from the lips of one man shall our souls be stirred by vigor of argument fused by a seraph's glow, and pouring itself forth in strains which linger around the memory like the chant of angels. Since his death, we have heard the regret expressed that his unwritten sermons had not been preserved through the labors of a reporter. It is well the attempt was never made. Dr. Thornwell could not have been reported. The spell of his eloquence would have paralyzed the skill of the most accomplished stenographer. But if not, what invented symbols could convey that kindling eye, those trembling and varied tones, the expressive attitude, the foreshadowing and typical gesture, the whole quivering frame, which made up in him the complement of the finished orator? It were as vain to sketch the thunder's roar or the lightning's flash—to paint the fleecy cloud or the white crest of the ocean wave. No!

the orator must live through tradition: and to make that tradition these feeble words are uttered by me to-night.

We transfer Dr. Thornwell, and view him next in THE CHURCH COURTS, the ecclesiastical statesman. Were we not addressing those perfectly conversant with the fact, we should fear to present this man of the closet as the wisest of practical counsellors. Yet the combination, though rare, is not unexampled. Paul, the writer and logician among the apostles, was, above them all, the man of action. He had upon him the care of all the churches, and was not inferior to the practical James in executive direction. Calvin, the great writer and expositor of the Reformation, bore upon his shoulders the weight of the Genevan state. So solid was his judgment, that all portions of the Reformed Church turned to him for advice; and the burden of his correspondence alone would have overwhelmed any ordinary man. So with him whose memory we cherish this day. In every sphere in which he moved—whether as a professor in the college faculty, or as a trustee in its board of administration, or in the broader area of an ecclesiastical council—he was remarked for his practical good sense, and became a leader among equals. One secret of this is found in the fact that his principles of action were all settled. They were not left to be gathered up in the hurry of an emergency, amid the dust and strife of debate; but were antecedently determined, and no temptation could induce him to swerve from their maintenance. No man was ever less under the guidance of mere expediency than he, whether the question related to the private intercourse of man with man, or ranged upon a higher scale in matters of public policy. None saw more clearly that so shifting a rule as that of expediency could never prescribe an even or consistent course. He fixed, therefore, for himself, finally and for ever, the great principles of private and of public morality, and these were his guides through every labyrinth of doubt. In this is found the capital distinction between

a ripe statesman and the stock-jobbing politician: the one starts out with catholic and fundamental principles, which determine his entire course; the other floats upon the current of events, is borne off into every eddy, and reflects little else but the changefulness of popular opinion. There is, indeed, with the former, continual danger of mistake in the application of his canons to particular cases. But an honest and clear mind, guarding itself against prejudice and passion, will not often trip; but will preserve, for the most part, a manly and beautiful consistency through all the shiftings of a public career.

Another element of Dr. Thornwell's influence in council lay in the caution with which all his particular judgments were formed—waiting for a full rendering of facts, and suspending his opinion until the case had been considered on every side. Even in the intimacy of private life, this cautiousness marked his utterances. An innate sense of justice and rare integrity of heart seemed to check a premature expression. Thus he was seldom constrained to retract his judgments. He was preserved, on the one hand, from the weakness of vacillation, and on the other, from the criminal obstinacy of adhering to opinions which ought to yield under the pressure of convincing reasons. Public confidence was continually challenged by this prudence of reserve, which had its springs alike in the dictates of wisdom and of moral propriety. He found an advantage, too, in the rapidity of his mental operations sweeping him on to his conclusions, far in advance of others. His wonderful power of analysis resolved complexities in which others were entangled; and whilst they were searching for the clue by which to extricate themselves, he had already seized the ultimate principle which unravelled all difficulties and settled every doubt. Nor should we omit, in this enumeration of his practical qualities, a certain positiveness of mind, which lifted him above the danger of indecision, and, as if by a sort of internal necessity, compelled him to

frame a positive judgment upon every issue. It is the infirmity of some minds to be always trembling upon the balance, incapable of deciding whether to descend upon this side or upon that of every question. These are the unfortunate incapables who swell the list of non-liquets on the records of our Church courts; or who, in their desperation, leap blindly upon a vote, as a man would leap from a railway train, not knowing whether he will land upon a bed of sand or in a brake of thorns. On the contrary, every deliberative body reveals examples of men who, by their greater positiveness of mind and character, lead those far superior to them in ability and general attainments—men in whom strength of will and decision of character stand in the stead of intellectual power. In a body of counsellors, the ready always lead the unready. From the imbecility here rebuked, Dr. Thornwell was perfectly free. In every situation he could not but think—if difficulties embarrassed any question, he only thought with more intensity—but he always thought to a conclusion. If he was cautious not to speak till his convictions were matured, yet he always came to time, and so always led.

But the moral quality which secured him unbounded influence as a counsellor was, the transparent honesty of his heart. He was no intriguer, had no by-ends to accomplish, never worked by indirection. His heart was in his hand, and every man could read it. When he rose in debate, the motto seemed to be engraved upon his forehead: "I believed, therefore have I spoken;" and he was believed. None doubted the sincerity of his utterance, or suspected a trap to catch the feet of the unwary. Straightforward himself, he dealt honestly with his colleagues: and if he could not carry his point by fair argument, he was content to fail. Winning confidence thus by his manly and truthful bearing, the cogency of his reasoning met with little resistance either of resentment or prejudice, and seldom succumbed under defeat.

For all the duties of a churchman, Dr. Thornwell was perfectly equipped. He had sifted the controversies which, through eighteen centuries, have been waged touching the organization of the Church, and had deduced from the writings of the apostles the principles which are fundamental to her existence through all coming time. He had studied with care the constitution of his own church, from those great principles which underlie her whole polity, to the minutest rule of order for her internal management; and no man ever surpassed him as an expounder of her laws. He was also versed in those parliamentary rules by which deliberative assemblies are usually governed; and thus, upon every hand, was fitted to be a leader in our ecclesiastical councils. Over the entire church he wielded the influence, though not clothed with the jurisdiction, of an acknowledged primate. The church signalized her appreciation of his abilities, not only by conferring upon him the highest honor in her gift, that of once presiding over her highest court, but also by calling him to the most responsible and difficult duties in all her assemblies. Both before and since the rupture of our national and ecclesiastical bonds, the delicate task of revising her code of discipline was twice placed mainly in his hands. Great as her loss may be, when she mourns over the greatest of her theologians and preachers, it will be felt heaviest, in this day of general reconstruction, now that her wisest statesman is removed from her councils. Never was there an hour, according to human view, when she could have spared him less; now, in the infancy of her new national existence, when her public policy needs to be drafted, and the principles clearly announced upon which her great enterprises are to be conducted, he that had the ear and the heart of the whole country is taken away, and the bereaved church covers her head with a mantle, and sits a mourner beside his grave. May it not be that he He who is supremely jealous of His own honor has, for a purpose, smitten our

trust in a human arm, and challenges a sublime faith in His own power and grace to lead us through all perils? If this be the lesson of His providence, may His Spirit seal it with sanctifying virtue upon the heart of the nation and of the Church!

Our survey will be complete when he have viewed Dr. Thornwell, in the last place, as A CHRISTIAN AND A MAN. Of an exceedingly spare habit, his medium stature diminished by a slight stoop; with a forehead well developed, but not ample; the features of his face small; with a carriage of the body rather marked by negligence than grace; his personal presence can not be described as commanding. Yet he would be singled out from a convention of men even by a careless observer. His hair rivalling the raven in its blackness, and, above all, his redeeming eye, deep set and black, and capable of the utmost intensity of expression, and a certain air of abstraction upon his countenance, denoted a man who was to be separated from others. The retirement of scholastic life, and the boundless resources he had within himself, withdrew him in a large measure from general intercourse with society. While his official relations sometimes forced him from seclusion, and his valuable counsels were invoked by many, he did not ordinarily put himself forth to seek communion with the bustling world around him. Though by no means an ascetic, and while his warm sympathies took hold of life upon every side, he was rather to be sought than to be himself a seeker. Whoever desired, might readily approach him; no man ever found himself repelled either by the coldness or the indifference of his manner. In general society, for which he had a confessed aversion, he was rather thoughtful and silent than communicative. But in the circle of his chosen friends, and in the bosom of his family, he poured forth the contents of his soul. It was then the entire nature of the man was revealed. Endowed with rare conversational powers, he emptied his stores of learning, and discussed his favorite themes of philosophy; or dived into the deeper

mysteries of religion, and uttered the experiences of his own heart; or else, descending from these graver topics, he sported with the glee of childhood itself in banter and jest, abounding with repartee, and diffusing the glow of his genial humor. Full of anecdote, and fond of badinage, his lighter conversation sparkled with wit; carried sometimes to excess, if one did not recognize it as the recreation of a mind that needed thus to unbend itself, and found its refreshment only in the easier play of its own powers. His affections were warm and enduring, often leading him to overestimate those in whom he confided. Lifted by his own greatness above the temptation of jealousy, he rejoiced, without the slightest infusion of envy, in the advancement of others. Generous in all his instincts, there was no sacrifice he would not make for his friends. Indulgent to his own household, he passed through its petty cares without permitting himself or them to be corroded by the anxieties of earth; but, smoothing over disappointments, he made life's path less rugged to their feet. Cherishing in his own heart the utmost loyalty to truth, he was never soured when thwarted in his projects; but waited with sublime confidence for truth and right to vindicate their own majesty. In this way, the dew of his youth was never exhaled; he remained elastic and fresh to the last, no generous sentiment or instinct of his nature being withered by age. With such attributes, he possessed the power of all truly great men, of magnetizing those brought under his influence; and it must have been a very strong or a very feeble nature that did not yield to his attraction. His friends are bound to him by cords of affection which even death will prove unequal to break.

> "He was one
> The truest manner'd; such a holy witch
> That he enchants societies unto him:
> Half all men's hearts were his."

As a Christian, it will suffice to say that the type of his theology was the type of his experience. He was not the

man to divorce the understanding from the heart. He concurred fully with all the Reformers in their definition of true faith, which, as Calvin says, is "not formed by the addition of pious affection as an accessory to assent, but the assent itself consists in pious affection." In his own language, "the form of Christian knowledge is love; it is a higher energy than bare speculation; it blends into indissoluble unity intelligence and emotion; knows by loving, and loves by knowing." Those, therefore, entirely misconceived him who supposed the form of his religious experience to be even predominantly intellectual; a religion of stern principle alone, separated from the affections of the heart. On the contrary, in his own beautiful exposition, "the mind sees not only the reality of truth, but its beauty and glory; it so sees as to make it feel; the perceptions are analogous to those of the right and beautiful, in which feeling exactly expresses the intellectual energy." His inner life practically illustrated this happy union of the mind and heart, and revealed the "faith which worketh by love." The same strong views which the theologian held upon the nature of sin, bowed the Christian in penitential grief before the Redeemer's cross; the same clear exposition given by the one of man's helplessness in a state of nature, cast the other upon the infinite power and riches of divine grace; the same clear discovery of the completeness and sufficiency of the atonement which made this the centre from which the preacher's discourses all radiate, led the believer to throw the arms of his affection around the Saviour with rapturous delight; the same conviction of the necessity for a divine revelation which led the Christian apologist to stand most stoutly in defence of its inspiration, bowed also his reason into the docility of faith before the teachings of Scripture; the same recognition of God's rightful supremacy which in the class-room placed the crown of dominion upon the King of kings, sustained the afflicted saint in the hour of bereavement, and filled his soul with solemn awe as he passed beneath the rod; the same intelligent reason

which owned the majesty and eternity of divine law, brought the will into the subjection of constant obedience to its commands; the same clear view of the resistless operations of the Holy Spirit, invoked His aid in the whole work of his own personal sanctification; and the same sense he entertained of the nature and functions of the Church of God, engaged him with his whole heart in her sublime efforts to evangelize the world. In short, a most beautiful harmony obtained between his secret exercises and his public utterances. There was no conflict between his preaching and his prayers. It was not one man in the class-room with his pupils, and another man in the closet with his God; but a delightful consistency ran through his character, both as a teacher and Christian.

We only state the great law of the Christian life, when we speak of growth—first the tender blade, and then the full corn in the ear. Dr. Thornwell ripened in holiness to the very hour of his translation. His humility became more profound, his faith more abiding, his love more glowing, his will chastened into deeper submission. He did not escape the discipline of sorrow by which the Lord refines His people. The cup of bereavement, with its bitterest ingredients, was once and again put to his lips. A delightful softness was diffused over his Christian character. The sharper and sterner features were worn down into more perfect symmetry and grace. He became more gentle in his censures, more catholic in his love. His views of the Divine holiness and of the Redeemer's glory, were always grand; they now became more sublime and adoring. He rose above the speculations of reason, and approached more nearly the ecstacy and rapture of a seraph. Upon his dying bed, the Holy Spirit placed His last seal upon his brow. Lying apparently unconscious for hours, most delightful smiles played over his countenance, like the flashings of a summer evening's cloud. His last broken words, upon which the departing soul was borne into the bosom of God, were ejaculations of wonder and of praise. "Wonderful!

beautiful! nothing but space! expanse, expanse, expanse!" and so he passed upward and stood before the Throne.

Christian fathers and brethren, it is idle to utter words of grief over the irreparable loss we have sustained.

> "Our size of sorrow,
> Proportioned to its cause, must be as great
> As that which makes it."

There are no words in which it may be embalmed and brought forth into public view. Rather let us, in the depth of our own sadness, bow in thanksgiving before that Infinite Goodness which lent him to us so long. We may, too, lawfully enter into his joy. With our hearts' love twining around him, we follow him in his sublime ascension, and heaven is brought nearer than before. Think of his first half-hour in heaven! standing within the gates of pearl, and looking with open gaze upon the transporting glories of the scene! Behold him in personal communion with those worthies of the Church militant with whom on earth he once held refreshing converse through their precious writings; sitting beside Owen, and Howe, and Charnock, and Flavel, and Baxter, and Erskine; joining in immortal discourse with Luther, and Beza, and Melancthon, and Zwingle, and Calvin; holding fellowship, face to face, with Peter, and with John, and with the beloved Paul, whose sacred words had so often inspired his holiest eloquence on earth; and passing up through the shining hierarchy, until his fresh crown is cast before the Lamb, while the arches of the grand Temple ring with the acclaim of ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, swelling anew the triumphant anthem of redeeming grace.

> "How glorious now, with vision purified
> At the Essential Truth, entirely free
> From error, he, investigating still,
> From world to world at pleasure roves, on wing
> Of golden ray upborne; or, at the feet
> Of heaven's most ancient sages sitting, hears
> New wonders of the wondrous works of God."

to show the falseness of this view of the cause of the decline of Greek and Italian civilization. Every profound thinker knows that the cause lay much deeper than this; that art itself rose, culminated, and declined, along with civilization in every other department. Instead of growing and battening, fungus-like, upon the decaying tree of civilization, it was itself the flower and fruit of that tree in its highest perfection.

The view of art spoken of above, at least as a popular view, is essentially modern. Such a view would have been utterly unintelligible to an ancient Greek. It originated, in its extreme form, with the Puritans of the seventeenth century, and was in thorough keeping with the whole Puritan philosophy; a philosophy which despised nature, external and internal, and which, therefore, despised both science and art; a philosophy which looked upon human culture and improvement as the total extirpation of nature within; the total eradication of natural appetites, impulses, and emotions of the heart, as either weak or essentially wicked and devilish. In a word, the Puritan spirit was *asceticism*, and the Puritan view of art was the view which ascetics, in all ages and countries, Christian and heathen, have taken. Now, the Puritan spirit was evidently a healthy, natural, and necessary reaction against the abuses of the times; an indignant uprising of the spirit of man and the assertion of its dignity against the miserable sensuousness and frivolities of the age. The Puritan view of art, too, was therefore a healthy reaction against the gross abuses of art. But, like all reactions, it has gone much beyond the line of truth and the limits of reason. It is really astonishing to observe the impress which the Puritans have left upon all subsequent ages, even to the present time; an impress far greater than most of us are willing to admit. The dress, the manners, the philosophy, social, religious, and political, most prevalent at the present day, are essentially Puritan. So, also, the Puritan view of art is still prevalent, in a mod-

ified form, among the people, and even among the most intelligent men, at least in this country. We are even now only recovering from the immense impulse given to society in one direction by the Puritan movement. We have just now begun to reflect how much of this direction is onward, and how much is to one side. We are only just now beginning to do real justice to the Puritan character and the Puritan movement. We are only now exchanging blind admiration, or equally blind hatred and prejudice, for rational and just estimate. Every just estimate, while admitting that no movement since the Reformation has conferred such lasting benefit upon society—has so signally advanced the cause of humanity—must, also, admit that much narrowness of view, prejudice, and serious error, was mingled with the benefit; that the line of impulse diverged sadly from the right line of truth and reason. The dawn of a more comprehensive and rational philosophy in the present age has rendered this divergence evident, and the evil effects patent to all but blind admirers.

Now, as Puritan morality was a necessary reaction against the corruptions of the age, so the Puritan view of art was also a necessary reaction against an extreme opposite view universally entertained by the gay, frivolous, and thoughtless cavaliers of the period. This was that art is essentially, and under all circumstances, cultivating and refining, and therefore to be used freely and without discrimination; that all that is said against art is mere puritanic cant, the contempt of which should rather lead to the other extreme. Thus, society on this subject was divided into two classes, occupying extreme positions, and all the more extreme by virtue of their mutual hatred. In the one were the indiscriminate despisers of art, as tending to weakness and effeminacy, and thus eventually to sensuality and vice; in the other, the equally indiscriminate, and, therefore, irrational worshippers of art. Both views were, in part, genuine and

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XV.—NO. 3.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART.

By the intelligent people, and even by many highly cultivated men, Fine Art is looked upon as essentially a mere pleasant illusion—as some thing entirely unreal and unsubstantial, or else as only a shadowy and imperfect imitation of nature. In its effects upon the mind, its uses in a scheme of human culture, it is looked upon as at best of doubtful import; as at best a pleasant recreation and relaxation from the sterner duties of conflict with nature; an amusement of an essentially low order; a purely sensuous enjoyment, which, though it may relax and rest our strength, can not in any sense be said to exercise and cultivate our higher faculties; but on the contrary, is almost certain to dissipate our strength, to paralyze our energies, to relax and effeminate our whole nature; or, still worse, to cultivate and strengthen the senses at the expense of the intellect, and thus degrade and brutify the nature. Plausibility is given to this view of art, by reference to the present condition of southern nations which have excelled in art, especially the Greeks and Italians. It would carry us too far

to show the falseness of this view of the cause of the decline of Greek and Italian civilization. Every profound thinker knows that the cause lay much deeper than this; that art itself rose, culminated, and declined, along with civilization in every other department. Instead of growing and battening, fungus-like, upon the decaying tree of civilization, it was itself the flower and fruit of that tree in its highest perfection.

The view of art spoken of above, at least as a popular view, is essentially modern. Such a view would have been utterly unintelligible to an ancient Greek. It originated, in its extreme form, with the Puritans of the seventeenth century, and was in thorough keeping with the whole Puritan philosophy; a philosophy which despised nature, external and internal, and which, therefore, despised both science and art; a philosophy which looked upon human culture and improvement as the total extirpation of nature within; the total eradication of natural appetites, impulses, and emotions of the heart, as either weak or essentially wicked and devilish. In a word, the Puritan spirit was *asceticism*, and the Puritan view of art was the view which ascetics, in all ages and countries, Christian and heathen, have taken. Now, the Puritan spirit was evidently a healthy, natural, and necessary reaction against the abuses of the times; an indignant uprising of the spirit of man and the assertion of its dignity against the miserable sensuousness and frivolities of the age. The Puritan view of art, too, was therefore a healthy reaction against the gross abuses of art. But, like all reactions, it has gone much beyond the line of truth and the limits of reason. It is really astonishing to observe the impress which the Puritans have left upon all subsequent ages, even to the present time; an impress far greater than most of us are willing to admit. The dress, the manners, the philosophy, social, religious, and political, most prevalent at the present day, are essentially Puritan. So, also, the Puritan view of art is still prevalent, in a mod-

ified form, among the people, and even among the most intelligent men, at least in this country. We are even now only recovering from the immense impulse given to society in one direction by the Puritan movement. We have just now begun to reflect how much of this direction is onward, and how much is to one side. We are only just now beginning to do real justice to the Puritan character and the Puritan movement. We are only now exchanging blind admiration, or equally blind hatred and prejudice, for rational and just estimate. Every just estimate, while admitting that no movement since the Reformation has conferred such lasting benefit upon society—has so signally advanced the cause of humanity—must, also, admit that much narrowness of view, prejudice, and serious error, was mingled with the benefit; that the line of impulse diverged sadly from the right line of truth and reason. The dawn of a more comprehensive and rational philosophy in the present age has rendered this divergence evident, and the evil effects patent to all but blind admirers.

Now, as Puritan morality was a necessary reaction against the corruptions of the age, so the Puritan view of art was also a necessary reaction against an extreme opposite view universally entertained by the gay, frivolous, and thoughtless cavaliers of the period. This was that art is essentially, and under all circumstances, cultivating and refining, and therefore to be used freely and without discrimination; that all that is said against art is mere puritanic cant, the contempt of which should rather lead to the other extreme. Thus, society on this subject was divided into two classes, occupying extreme positions, and all the more extreme by virtue of their mutual hatred. In the one were the indiscriminate despisers of art, as tending to weakness and effeminacy, and thus eventually to sensuality and vice; in the other, the equally indiscriminate, and, therefore, irrational worshippers of art. Both views were, in part, genuine and

earnest; and both, in part, through antagonism, degenerated into cant and affectation. Both views still exist at the present day. The first class consists mostly of religious, thoughtful, earnest men; the second, mostly of the gay, the thoughtless, frivolous, and irreligious. Between these extremes there has been steadily growing a third class, in intelligent communities the largest of all, which may be considered as entertaining the prevailing view of art at the present time, viz.: that it is mere pleasant, and, in moderation, innocent amusement; mere sensuous enjoyment; mere pleasant illusion; which does well enough to while away an idle moment, and stand in place of grosser and more dangerous pleasures, but entirely useless as a means of cultivating our higher faculties, or fitting us in any way for the practical duties of life; that it is essentially an illusory and fictitious world, entirely disconnected with, or at least but a shadowy imitation of the world of reality; a world of *fiction, falsehood*, and pleasant deceit, in contrast with the world of *truth* and *fact*. Now, our object in the present article is, if possible, to show in how far these views are right and in how far they are wrong; in short, to define the *true nature of art*, and to point out its *true uses*, and its *abuses*.

We remember once having heard it objected to Dr. McGuffey, the distinguished professor of moral philosophy in the University of Virginia, (a man whose suggestiveness of mind will be conceded by all who have ever listened to his conversation or his lectures,) that he was much too fond of fanciful paradoxes. As an instance, it was stated that in a popular lecture he had actually startled his audience out of their propriety, by asserting that *a steam engine was not a fact, but a fiction*. We know not the solution of the apparent paradox given by the Doctor himself, but we are much indebted to it for the suggestion of many trains of productive thought.

What is *fact?* and what is *fiction?* The answer to this question involves one of two conclusions: either that all art and all products of art are *fiction*, or else that no genuine art is fiction. Perhaps the only philosophic distinction between fact and fiction is, that a *fact* is a work of nature, existing irrespective of man, and perhaps even opposed to him; a *fiction*, from *fingo*, is a thing having no existence in nature, but purely the creation of man, the *contrivance* of his brain, and the work of his *fingers*. In this sense, all works of art, mechanical as well as fine art, are fictions, and the more so, as they have no analogies in nature. Now, can any thing be more a pure creation of man's brain, can any thing be more diverse from a natural product, than a steam engine? In this sense, all the so-called great facts of the age, such as the steam engine, the electric telegraph, etc., are fictions. But there is another and more popular sense in which the word fiction is used. With the change of opinion which has taken place in modern times with regard to the nature and use of fine art, there has been, also, apparently, a gradual change in the definition of the word *fiction*. It has gradually changed from the natural signification indicated by its derivation. It has come to mean a cheat, a delusion, a deception, a mere clever trick, a juggle. And the pleasure we take in fiction is accounted for on the principle contained in the well-known lines of Hudibras:

> "Doubtless, the pleasure is as great,
> Of being cheated as to cheat."

Now, in this sense, it is true, the products of mechanical art are at once excluded from the domain of fiction, and fall into the domain of fact. Surely, there is nothing delusive, deceptive, or imitative in these. These are *real* products of man's mind. They imitate nothing, and therefore can not deceive or cheat. But are there not departments of fine art, too, which are pure products of the human mind, and unlike any thing in nature—which are essentially

non-imitative, and, therefore, non-deceptive and *real?* Are not Music, Poetry and Architecture, pure products of the human mind? Is there any thing in nature at all similar to these. "Music! Poetry! Ah, but these," answers the objector, "belong to the unreal and delusive world of the imagination." Think you, then, that no imagination, no genius, was required in the original creation of the steam engine? "But music and poetry are intangible, immaterial, unpractical; the steam engine is solid, practical, useful matter." Alas! yes, here is the true difference. It all amounts, then, to this: *whatever belongs to this world, whatever is solid matter, whatever subserves the purposes of our purely material nature, is real, and belongs to the domain of fact; and whatever belongs to the spiritual world, the world of feeling and sentiment, and subserves the purposes of our spiritual nature, is unreal and fictitious.* Then, indeed, art has no reason to complain of the word fiction. For then love and honor, faith and religion, in short, all that is worth living for, are fictions. "But," again answers the objector, "the products of mechanical art are practical and useful, they produce visible results in the amazing impulse given by them to human civilization, while no such results are visible as the effect of music or poetry." We will not attempt to answer this objection now, but hope to show in the sequel that the culture of the human mind, and the progress of civilization, is at least as closely connected with fine art as with so-called useful art.

But there are other departments of fine art which are called *imitative.* Are not these essentially deceptive in their nature? Let us examine this subject a little more closely.

Art, in its widest sense, as the sensible product of the human mind, is divided into two great divisions, the so-called *useful arts*, and *fine art.* Useful art is the human embodiment of the laws of the *forces* of nature; fine art, the human embodiment of the laws of *form* and of *harmonic relations* in nature. The former is the product principally of the human *understanding*, since the laws of force

are mainly apprehended by the understanding; the latter is mainly the product of *imagination* and *feeling*, since it is through these faculties that the laws of form and of harmonic relations are apprehended. Hence, the one may be called the embodiment of *the laws of the human understanding*, or mechanics; the other, of *the laws of human feeling*, or æsthetics. Fine art is again divided into the *non-imitative*, which are purely original embodiments of laws of æsthetics, without any analogies in nature; and the so-called *imitative*, which are equally embodiments of æsthetic laws, but less purely original, since a product of nature forms the basis and suggests the idea upon which the work of art is made. In the one case, the mind acts under its own inspiration; in the other, under the inspiration of external nature. To the first class belong Music, Poetry, Architecture; to the second belong Sculpture, Painting, and also the Drama and the Novel. Now, these latter are usually looked upon as purely imitative, and nothing more. Mechanic arts are acknowledged to be purely human and original; the non-imitative fine arts must also be acknowledged to be purely original and human. But the imitative branches of fine art are apt to be looked upon as purely imitative, as a simple copy of nature; and the work is supposed perfect in proportion as the copy is accurate. Now, the very fact that these are branches of fine art—the very fact that these exercise the same faculties of the mind, both in the appreciation and the execution, as the other departments acknowledged to be non-imitative, is sufficient to prove to the reflective mind that they are not the product of the imitative faculty. Pure imitative art is mechanic art, and that, too, of the lowest kind. It requires neither sense of beauty nor imagination, but only accurate measurement. It exercises neither imagination nor feeling, but only the understanding. The copyist of nature bears the same relation to the true artist, which the ordinary manu-

facturer of the steam engine does to its great inventor and creator, James Watt.

The common view of art, as we have already said, is that it is essentially deceptive and cheating. The highest object of art is supposed to be, to render this delusion of the senses—this cheating of the soul through the senses or through the emotions, as perfect as possible. This cheating may be accomplished in two ways, either by exact *imitation* merely, as in *landscape* and *portrait* painting; or else by exciting the senses, the appetites and emotions, to such a degree as to overpower the intellect and the higher sentiments, as in music, poetry, the drama, the novel, the dance, etc.; in a single word, by *intoxicating;* for all excitement of the lower appetites and emotions beyond the control of the higher faculties and the will, is truly intoxication. Thus, then, the power to *deceive* by exact imitation, or else to *intoxicate* by undue excitement of sense and emotion, is considered the highest function of art. Thus, a perfect landscape is supposed to be one which completely deceives us into a belief of reality; one in which, taking the frame for a window, we seem to look out upon an actual view of nature, as in the "cosmoramic views" once so celebrated in this country. A perfect drama or novel is supposed to be one in which the audience is completely spell-bound, deceived into complete belief of reality, and intoxicated by emotion. This idea is embodied in the well-known story of trial of skill between Zeuxis and Parrhasius, in which the painted grapes of the former were pecked at by birds, while the painted curtain of the latter deceived even the experienced Zeuxis himself; again, in the story of the Helen of Zeuxis, which was imitated from the several beauties of many women. Now, we do not hesitate to assert that the common idea of the function of art, so finely embodied in these stories of Zeuxis, is radically erroneous, and not only erroneous, but extremely degrading to art and hurtful to society. The contest between Zeuxis and Parrhasius was, indeed, a

trial of skill, but not of genius. Whatever was the theory of art among the Greeks, it is certain that the instincts of Greek genius were far different from this. No artists have been so little imitative as the Greeks. No artists have cared so little for, or relied so little upon, sensuous deception for success—have been so purely ideal—as the Greeks. This is particularly true of their drama, which was exhibited without scenic effect, in the open air and open daylight, and apparently even avoiding deception, as unbecoming the true artist, by means of the cothurnus and the mask. If, then, art is not a pleasant delusion, what *is* its true nature? We will attempt to show.

Nature is *infinite* in every way; in extent, in greatness, and in minuteness, in multiplicity of detail, and in unity of thought. Art, on the contrary, is *finite* in every way. Nature is divine; art is human. Again: nature is not only infinite, but *perfect.* Man is not only finite, but *fallen.* and depraved.

But observe, next, in what this depravity consists. The simple primary faculties of our nature can not properly be classed as *good* and *bad*, (since all were possessed by Adam and even by Christ himself,) but rather as *high* and *low.* There is a gradation in the faculties of the mind; and their proper position as to authority and subordination is determined by their rank. The human soul may be compared to an organized society. In the perfect, unfallen man, all the faculties and powers take their natural position, and Reason, counselled by Faith, holds the reins. In the fallen man, on the contrary, the subjects have revolted, and the governor is overthrown and manacled. Reason, not heeding the counsels of Faith, has been overborne by the rebellious impulses, passions, and appetites, which now hold the reins of government, and all is discord, anarchy, and confusion. Thus, in our present fallen condition, it happens that the faculties of the soul are naturally *strong in proportion to their lowness*, and are *weak in proportion to their dignity.*

The whole object, then, of every thing noble in this world, of religion, of science, of art, of culture and training of all sorts, of all our strivings and ceaseless internal conflicts, is, or should be, to restore again the pristine harmony of the soul. How can this be accomplished, except by subduing the lower, or by strengthening the higher faculties, or by both? This, then, must be the object of a *true art.* How is this to be done?

Nature, as we have already said, is infinite. It addresses every faculty of the human soul. To the unfallen man it is a complete revelation of Deity. It combines the highest and noblest, through infinite gradations, with the lowest and most commonplace. It addresses the senses, the emotions, the sentiments, the reason. But, on account of the fallen, depraved condition of man, the low and commonplace in nature are seen by all men, and even by animals, since they are apprehended by the senses; while the high and noble—the appeals to the higher sentiments, to the imagination and to the reason—are felt only by the noble and imaginative, and by these only in favored moments. Thus, the higher faculties are overborne by the strength and multiplicity of the sensuous impressions. Thus, in viewing a landscape, the multiplicity of detail interferes with perception of harmonious relation—the sensuous impression overbears the imaginative and æsthetic faculty. Thus, too, in science, the infinite detail of *facts* interferes with the perception of *law.* But we will have illustrations enough of this before we are done.

But again: nature not only thus strongly impresses our senses and overpowers the mind through the infinite multiplicity of its detail, but also awakens our appetites, passions, and emotions, and thus in a still more lamentable way overpowers the mind and degrades the soul. In the first sense, nature is too great for us—we are stupefied; in the second, nature is too strong for us—we are overthrown and enslaved. What can we do? We can only bow down

before nature, external and internal, in stupid, abject worship. Thus arises the lowest form of religion, viz.: fetichism. Now, we are all to some extent the enslaved worshippers of nature. It is the function of art, as well as of religion and science, to release us from this bondage. We should say to art: "Come between us and this nature, and interpret for us, for she is too strong and too great for us. Be thou the priestess to this divinity." In art we view nature through the mind of the artist, and thus see more that is great and noble in nature than we otherwise could. Nature is infinite. In her totality, therefore, she is beyond all human comprehension. Men differ in the amount and kind of what they see. The great artist sees all that is seen by common men, and much beside. Now, it is this *much beside* which must be revealed by the artist. The common man does not, or rather ought not to, care to see a mere imperfect imitation, a duplicate, of what he already sees much better in nature. He ought rather to have revealed to him, whether he wishes it or no, what he does not see in nature. Here, then, is the true difference between high and low art. The true artist, from the sum of all that he sees in nature, purposely selects some parts and rejects others, and makes this selection in such manner as to *subdue somewhat the sensuous impression, and strengthen the impression upon the higher faculties;* by means of his selection he diminishes the multiplicity of incomprehensible detail, or subdues somewhat the sensuous and emotional impression, thus freeing the mind from the bondage of sense and passion, and then takes advantage of this freedom to suggest noble thoughts. On the contrary, the low artist either sees not, or wilfully rejects, what is noblest and highest for a mere clever deceptive imitation of the sensuous impression. Thus, he is either in soul no artist at all, or else he prostitutes his art by pandering to a low taste in the multitude; he sells his divine birth-right for a mess of pottage.

Thus, nature is certainly greater than art; but, through our fallen condition, art—a true art—becomes a better teacher of man than nature. Nature was intended for the unfallen man, to cultivate every faculty of his soul. It was intended that the divine truth should stream in from nature through every window of the human soul, brightening ever the image of God already impressed there. But alas! through man's fall, nature no longer elevates, but often degrades the human soul; the windows open only into the outer court, the inner sanctuary remains dark. Through man's fall the higher faculties are in humiliating bondage to the lower. The true mission of art, like religion, is, by subduing somewhat the sensuous and emotional, and strengthening the higher faculties—the imagination, the sense of beauty, etc.—to set these latter free; to pluck the soul from the miry clay, that it may take its upward flight. The state of mind, then, which it is the object of high art to produce, is one in which the senses, passions, or emotions are powerfully impressed, but the intellect equally or still more so; and these two thus standing in violent conflict, but the latter predominant, are, as it were, fused into one by the fervid glow of the imagination, and brought into perfect harmony by the sense of beauty; and the man stands all glowing, but not melted; all afire, but no wise consuming; but rather elevated, purified, strengthened. This we will call the æsthetic condition of mind. It is a sort of serenity of mind; not mere passive serenity, but the serenity of strong, vigorous, but harmonious activity. In fact, the stronger the emotion and passion—the more fiery the glow—the nobler the condition, if only harmony and self-mastery still prevail.

We can render these principles plainer by no longer dwelling upon abstract generalities, but by illustrations drawn from every department of art, or even from departments more or less remotely connected with art. Our first

illustrations may seem trivial, but we hope as we multiply them the principle will become clearer.

1. The pleasures of anticipation, particularly in persons of vivid imagination, are often greater and purer than those of fruition; because the absence of the *real* gives place to the *ideal;* the absence of the sensuous impression gives free play to the imagination. In the actual fruition we ought to have all the anticipated pleasure we had before, and the pleasure of sense besides; or rather, both of these should become only more intense by nearer approach; but alas! the sensuous impression too often interferes with and overpowers the higher pleasures, and we are disappointed.

2. Absence from loved ones, in persons of very strong imagination, or in whom imagination and a love of the ideal predominates over true heart affection, produces similar effects. Love takes the æsthetic form, under the transforming power of the imagination. Presence—sensuous impression—too often breaks the charm.

3. "'Tis distance lends enchantment to the view," and for the same reason. Near at hand the strength of the sensuous impression interferes with the higher faculties; the multiplicity of detail overpowers the perception of relation; the strong sensuous impression of the parts overpowers the general æsthetic perception of the whole. Distance, by softening the sensuous impression, by decreasing the multiplicity and the distinctness of the parts, sets the intellect free. A great battle, or a great waterfall, at a distance is a noble subject of contemplation, and produces that exalted serenity of mind in which excitement is united with calmness, which we have called the æsthetic condition. But amid the roar of cannon, or the din of the waterfall, passion, emotion, and violent sensuous impression, swallows up and drowns every other faculty of the mind.

4. Time, like space, by softening the sensuous or emotional impression or both, brings the mind into the æsthetic condition. A strong, noble man, full of keen sensibilities and

powerful emotion, has been struck down by the hand of Providence; a great affliction has fallen upon him—the loss of a beloved wife or an only child. In the first agony of emotion, he simply falls prostrate and grovelling in the dust; the strong man is unmanned, every faculty of the mind subdued, overwhelmed, and crushed by grief; he expresses his anguish only in incoherent exclamations and ejaculations. Such an one is an object of pity, but surely not an object of admiration. But time passes on—a week, a month, a year of terrible, victorious conflict. Now behold him again; his form is again erect, his face again calm, but its expression elevated, purified, ennobled. He is still under strong feeling, but reason and faith predominate. He is still assaulted by strong emotion, but master of himself. Now he is no longer an object to be pitied, but to be admired and reverenced. Now, if he be a man of fervid imagination and strong sense of beauty, his emotions are no longer expressed in exclamations and unmeaning ejaculations, but take the form of art, and break forth in poetry or in song. No true art is possible until the condition of mind described is attained; and it is the object of all true art to bring about this very condition—calm, but glowing; moved, but strong—this pure, elevated, ecstatic condition of noble emotion in the minds of others. Art produced in any other condition of the mind, or before this condition is entirely attained, is always morbid, false, intoxicating, and therefore debasing.

5. Mrs. Jameson illustrates the "Characteristics of Women," not by examples taken from history, nor yet from women of her own acquaintance, nor indeed at all from the world of fact, but from the world of fiction—from the women of Shakspeare. She very properly justifies this choice on the ground that we know and understand the characters of Shakspeare much better than we do historical characters, or even our best friends; in fact, often much better than we do ourselves. This is an admirable illustration of the manner in which art reveals nature

to us. In our loved friends, and still more in ourselves, the multiplicity of daily, hourly impressions, capable of different construction; the infinite mixing and mingling of many motives and feelings in every action of life; the deceptions of self-love or of affection, or of every other passion and emotion of our nature, is so great that a thoroughly just estimate of the character is impossible; the complexity of the problem is so infinite, that without assistance we must despair of its solution. Now, the object of the artist is to reduce this complex problem to its simplest terms; to remove one complication after another, until the fundamental idea of the character is left bare and simple. For this purpose, first the sensuous impression is removed; we hear and see the characters only through the imagination; next, all personal interest, with all the involved selfish feelings which so distort our vision and deceive our minds, are also removed; then, among the infinite actions and speeches which appertain by nature to every individual, only such are selected as really throw light upon the character; all other actions and speeches as are of no significance, or are of significance contrary to the real character, or of which the significance would, at least, be not apparent to human eyes, are excluded as merely overloading the picture and distracting the mind. A character thus drawn is understood with comparative ease, and in its turn becomes the key to the more difficult study of human nature as exemplified in the actual world, or in our own hearts. If we bring our eyes very near the human face, we see with the utmost distinctness not only every feature, but even every pimple and pore and texture of the skin; but we catch not the general expression, we see not the soul which shines through the face. We may approach a building until every brick, and even every grain of sand composing each brick, may be distinctly visible, but the noble thought expressed in the building is not thus seen. So, also, we may bring our eyes so near the

human heart, we may examine our own so closely with the microscope of introspection, that we shall know every wrinkle, and pore, and pimple, and blemish, and yet see not the divine image which still remains, though blurred. In all these instances, the strength and the multiplicity of the sensuous impression overpowers the general intellectual impression. Art, by removing us to a distance, until insignificant details are no longer visible; by removing the senseless rubbish which has accumulated through carelessness and want of definite purpose; exhibits the character in its grand outlines. Thus, by removing the sensuous and subduing the emotional, the higher faculties of the mind and soul are set free.

It is curious to observe the difference between Milton's Eve and Shakspeare's female characters, in this respect; a difference which characterizes dramatic and epic poetry. Milton is elaborately descriptive of the personal appearance and loveliness of Eve; Shakspeare never describes the persons of his females. It seems to us that the very want of any distinct conception of the *persons* in the latter case, makes possible a clearer and distincter conception of the *characters.*

6. Sculpture. We know no finer illustration of the true nature and use of art than can be drawn from representations of the human form. The nude human form, in its best examples, is of course more perfect, more beautiful, and, therefore, in itself more fitted to touch and cultivate the highest faculties of the mind, than any representation in marble; and yet who can doubt that the latter is actually more cultivating? And why? Because, in the contemplation of the natural nude figure, the mind of the spectator is not free, but enslaved by the strength of the sensuous impression. All that is beautiful in the higher sense, all that is graceful in form and noble in expression, is lost sight of, is, in fact, overpowered and drowned in the lower feelings. But subdue this sensuous impression; let the life, the

warmth, the softness and flesh-tint of nature be replaced by the purity, the coldness, the hardness, and the whiteness of marble; the mind is set free, and may now receive impressions of the noblest kind; now the mind is open to receive a true æsthetic impression. The sensuous is not, indeed, eradicated, but subdued to its proper rank of subordination to the higher faculties; in which position, so far from interfering with, it is a necessary element in the highest æsthetic impression. But now paint this statue again to the life; in other words, *imitate nature* as perfectly as possible; do we not feel at once that it is ruined as a work of high art? Can any thing show more plainly that art is not a mere imitation of nature, perfect in proportion to the accuracy of the imitation; but that it essentially differs from nature, and that this difference is not a mere inferiority, the result of the imperfection of the artist, but is voluntary and with a purpose, which purpose is immediately connected with our fallen nature? Can any thing show more plainly that, though abstractly—from the divine standpoint—art is infinitely inferior to nature, yet, to fallen man it is far superior?

7. It is generally supposed that the Drama is but a deceptive imitation of nature, which is perfect in proportion to the completeness of the deception. It is generally supposed, even by intelligent and cultivated men, that a really great tragedy is one in which, when well acted, the whole audience is overwhelmed and unmanned, not only dissolved in tears, but completely crushed; in which the deception is so complete, and the emotion so great, that perhaps twenty men leap from the pit upon the stage to stop the murder and rescue the victim; in which the excitement is so overpowering, that a farce is absolutely necessary to restore the mind to its healthy tone, otherwise the audience return home low-spirited and melancholy, retire to bed only to have the night-mare, and rise in the morning exhausted, the nervous system unstrung, and the mind relaxed and unfit

for business. Alas! is such, then, the highest triumph of art? If such intoxication be the end of art, then surely all the objections ever brought against it by the most ultra Puritan only fall short of the truth. If such excitement be the end of art, then much better go to see actual murders and hangings, for here the excitement is still more intense; then Roman gladiator shows are to be preferred to the representations of Greek drama. This, in fact, is precisely the view of the rude and brutal Roman, but how different from that of the cultivated and refined Greek. But no! this is not the triumph, but the degradation, of art. It is the triumph of low imitative art, but high art delights not in such effects.

Let us examine this subject a little more closely. Suppose we are actually present when Othello murders Desdemona, and every thing occurs exactly as represented by Shakspeare; the same noble language, the same glowing imagery, the same profound moral reflections: Is it probable that we would heed this noble language, that our imagination would be kindled by the glowing imagery, that the moral reflections would take root in our breasts? On the contrary, the storm of passionate emotion would sweep like a tornado over our souls, ravaging all its beauty, and scattering to the winds all its fairest flowers. The æsthetic impression of the whole would be utterly lost in the violence of the sensuous and emotional impression. But wait now a week or a month, until time shall have subdued somewhat the emotion; and then, if memory still retains it, the whole scene will take the form of art; then the mind is set free, and is open to receive whatever noble lesson may be drawn from the scene; in other words, the mind is now in what we have called the æsthetic condition: that is, under strong emotion, but the intellect still predominant, and the imagination and the sense of beauty fusing the whole into a perfect unit, in which the separate impressions are undistinguishable—a state of exalted but glowing serenity.

Now, exactly this state, which has been brought about by time acting through memory on a highly endowed mind; exactly this state it is the end of art to produce; and it does so in a somewhat similar manner. The artist subdues the sensuous and emotional by removing reality; he still further removes the scene into the ideal world, by the employment of *verse*, which would otherwise have no significance. He then selects only such actions and speeches as to the susceptible and yet reflective mind, would suggest noble thoughts and high emotions; he then, by the imagination and the sense of harmony, moulds these, in his hands plastic materials, into a true unit—a work of art which shall also kindle the imagination, and touch the æsthetic sense in the susceptible listener.

What, then, is the true ideal of acting? Evidently the perfect carrying out of the conception and the purpose of the ideal artist. The purpose of art is to teach, to purify, to ennoble, to elevate, and strengthen. Let no man dare to undertake to act, who can not carry out this purpose. The true actor must be a noble man in soul; his form and tread must be expressive of real dignity, and not the miserable and ridiculous stage strut, which conventionally stands for dignity; his passion must be noble, and therefore nobly, and, to a certain extent, calmly expressed; his imagination must be vivid, and his sense of beauty fine, and all this must be expressed visibly, though naturally. In a word, he must be a true lover of high art, and strive to carry out its purpose. Judged by this standard, how much of the drama, and how much of acting, is true art? The actor studies only to make a *strong* impression, careless as to the nature of that impression. But, as it is our lower feelings which are strongest, and most easily excited, he generally addresses himself to these; and by noise and rant, by violent excitement and over-acting of every kind, all that is finest in thought, or most delicate in beauty, is entirely drowned and lost. Whatever dramatic exhibitions may have been

at one time, there can be no doubt that they have degenerated, both as to the character of the plays and the manner of acting, to such an extent—they pander to such a degree to a low taste for mere excitement—that they are now seldom or never improving in any way. We believe we speak the feelings of the most cultivated and genuine lovers of high art, when we say that dramatic representations are sadly disappointing; that a really great work of art, like one of Shakspeare's masterpieces, is dreadfully marred in the acting; that the stage is no longer the representative of the most refined taste in art; but, on the contrary, that a conventional taste has been perpetuated from time immemorial upon the stage, which is thoroughly disgusting to the man of true culture. It is for this reason that, while the reading and the appreciation of Shakspeare's plays have constantly increased, the representation of them on the stage has constantly diminished. This change we do not believe to be temporary, but will be permanent; since it has its ground not in religious prejudice, as imagined by many, but in a sound philosophy of art. There can be no doubt that the impression produced upon the mind by the appreciative *reading* of one of Shakspeare's dramas is higher, purer, more truly æsthetic, than can be produced by *acting*. The impression produced by acting is stronger, but at the same time lower. The pleasure in the former case is weaker, but higher; in the latter, more intense, but coarser. There can be no doubt that, even in the best acting, and still more in all but the best, the sensuous and emotional interferes too much with the higher faculties for the freest activity of the latter; that the finest flights of fancy, the subtlest touches of character, the most delicate aroma of Poetry, must be sacrificed. It is the keener appreciation of these in modern times which, among many other reasons, has caused the decline of the stage.

These principles, if correct, form a standard by which to judge the relative merits of the drama of various periods

and nations. If, for instance, we compare the tragedies of Shakspeare with the later tragedy, we will at once see the vast superiority of the former. Let it be remembered, that nature and art address both our lower and our higher nature—both our sensuous and emotional nature, on the one side, and our æsthetic nature on the other—but with this difference, that nature impresses our lower faculties—our senses and emotions—too powerfully, and thus overbears, and in all but the highest minds, destroys the higher impression; while it is the object of art to readjust the relative position of these two. Thus, we might briefly say that there are in all art, as well as in nature, two elements: the sensuous, or emotional, and the æsthetic. The first is some times called expression, life, power, passion, naturalness; the second, beauty, grace, unity, ideality. Now, in a high art the latter is always predominant; in a low art, the former is always predominant. Still, in a true art, particularly the drama, the emotional element must not be wanting. On the contrary, the stronger the emotion, the higher the work, provided always the mental balance is not overthrown. The more power, passion, energy, expression, pathos, can be put into a work, the better, and the nobler the work, provided the æsthetic impression still predominate; provided the intellectual harmony is still preserved. In the highest work of art, both of these elements must be strong; the stronger the better; but their relative strength must be maintained. If the æsthetic element is too weak, the mental harmony is overthrown, the work is morbid; if the emotional element is too weak, the work is cold and lifeless. But, since nature impresses most strongly and easily our lower faculties, it is evident that a deceptive imitation of nature, can only be achieved in art by addressing these lower faculties. Thus, a deceptive imitation of nature is always an index of low art. It is not that such art contains *more truth* of nature than high ideal art, but only that it contains more *obvious truth*. It is not that such art is

really more like nature, but only more like nature as seen by common eyes, and apprehended by common minds.

Now, the whole effort of the later tragedy has been to satisfy the false view of art so common in modern times. There is no doubt of the fact that the empowering emotional effect of such plays as the "Stranger," or "the Gambler's Wife," is far greater than that of any of Shakspeare's dramas, for the simple reason that the dramas first spoken of address only the emotional nature, while in Shakspeare's dramas, strong as the emotional impression is, the impression on our higher nature is still stronger. Thus, while the former intoxicates, unnerves, unmans; the latter purifies, invigorates, and strengthens our manhood. But, on account of the prevalence of depraved taste in art—on account of the *love of intoxication*—Shakspeare's plays can hardly maintain their footing on the stage.

In comparing the Greek drama with the modern, (of which we take Shakspeare as the type,) the former would seem more perfect and complete, and more purely ideal, than the latter. The Greek seems more perfect, because more simple; the modern more imperfect, because more complex, varied, and difficult. As we have expressed it elsewhere,* the Greek belongs to a simpler, lower type of art, but more completely developed; the modern, to a higher and more complex type, but more imperfectly developed. The difference between sculpture and painting represents well, though not perfectly, the characteristic difference between ancient and modern art generally, and especially the difference between ancient and modern drama. In sculpture we have only the antagonism between the simplest sensuous impression, and the purest æsthetic impression of ideal beauty of form. In painting we have not only form, but color; not only beauty of form, but harmony of color; not only sense, but also emotion. The variety of impression is far more difficult to

* Southern Pres. Rev., Vol. XII., p. 111.

adjust into harmonious unity. The Greek drama, in fact all Greek art, in comparison with modern, is like sculpture. It stands out in more complete unity, in more definite outline and relief. Its composition, or rather organization, is more simple. We have only the antagonism between the simplest and commonest emotions, and the purest and highest æsthetic ideal. In Shakspeare, on the contrary, this wide chasm is filled up by an infinite variety of impressions, addressing every faculty of the mind. We have the greatest variety of characters, individualized with the utmost subtlety; the greatest variety of emotions, thoughts, feelings, distinguished with the utmost delicacy; the greatest variety of incidents, occurring in various places and at different times; (for Shakspeare acknowledges no unity but the unity of action;) the profoundest philosophical reflection, the sublimest analysis of character and thought, the most daring flights of strong imagination, and the gentlest play of delicate fancy; all these and much more combined in a single play. Is it to be wondered at, that the harmonious coördination of so much diversity should be imperfect; that the perfect oneness of impression characteristic of a work of art, is incomplete? And yet we believe this incompleteness is rather apparent than real. In proportion as we rise to the more and more complete comprehension of Shakspeare's dramas, in the same proportion does the unity, the true æsthetic impression, of the whole become more complete also. We must rise to the stand-point of the artist, before the complete unity of his work is seen. We must rise to the stand-point of Deity, before the perfect unity of nature, as a work of art, is comprehended. We must rise to the stand-point of Shakspeare, before the perfect unity of his dramas is seen. Below that point, we are attracted by minor beauties of scenes and passages and delineations of character, as is the case with most of the criticisms of Shakspeare, rather than the general æsthetic effect. In fact, we ought to appreciate the

general effect of the whole, without thereby losing sight of the effect of the parts.

Thus, then, the stand-point of the highest modern art is higher than the ancient. The task which is proposed—the mission of modern art—is more difficult to fulfil. For that very reason, most artists in modern times, through weakness, or indolence, or cowardice, prove recreant to their mission; for that very reason, false art is more common in modern times; for that very reason, also, modern art is more corrupting than ancient, particularly to the young, and therefore *a solid basis of pure, healthy taste in art must always be laid in the study of the antique.* We see, also, at once, *the importance of the study of Scripture in forming a healthy taste.*

In a similar manner, we might point out the characteristics of the German and French drama; but the principle once clearly understood, there will, we think, be no difficulty in applying it to individual cases.

We have spoken, thus far, only of the *tragic* drama. *Comedy* may be reduced to the same principles, though, perhaps, with more difficulty. For the purposes which we have in view, all comedy may be divided into three distinct classes or schools, viz.: the Greek, the Elizabethan, and the French; or, as they have been otherwise called, the ancient, the romantic, and the modern. The first is represented by Aristophanes, the second by Shakspeare, and the third by the French and English comedy since the time of Charles the Second. Comparing broadly these with one another, the first is the embodiment of *fun;* the second, of *humor;* the third, of *wit and satire:* the first is the "inextinguishable laughter of the gods;" the second, the *kindly smile* of sympathy with human weakness; the third, the bitter *laugh of contempt*, the *heartless sneer*, or the sardonic *grin* of concealed hatred. In the ancient, the animal nature is predominant, and it is, therefore, intoxicating; in the French, the intellect predominates, and it is, therefore, cold; it excites laughter, but does not warm the heart. The ancient comedy

subordinates the intellect to sense; the French comedy subordinates kindly emotion and human sympathy to cold, dissecting, anatomizing intellect. The ancient is the joyous reign of animal nature; the French, the reign of scepticism and disbelief in human virtue. The one is the natural revulsion from the earnestness of tragedy; the other, from the earnestness of Puritanism.

Now Shakspeare, in every respect, stands between these extremes, and is, therefore, the embodiment of true art. The best of Shakspeare's comedies, such as "the Tempest," "the Merchant of Venice," "As You Like It," and several others, are the work of a playful imagination, but kindly nature, full of the deepest sympathy with human weakness and human error. They are rather romances, than what most people (because educated in the French school) would call pure comedy—romances in which the varied and shifting scenes of human life, with its "mingled yarn" of joy and sorrow, of comic and serious, are exhibited as we find them in nature, only that the low and comic is always subordinate to the noble and serious.

A few words upon the state of society which gave rise to these different schools of art, will, perhaps, throw further light upon their peculiarities, as well as upon the nature of art in general. The Greek comedy finds its sufficient explanation in the free joyousness and exuberant animal spirits of this remarkable people, as otherwise exhibited in their Olympic games, and in their extravagant and, to us, almost childish bacchanalian sports. The Elizabethan and French comedy deserve a little more thorough comparison. During the Elizabethan age, society and public opinion had not yet acquired sufficient power and authority to compel any thing like uniformity in manners. Each man acted out his natural character, without hindrance, and, in a great measure, without shame. The body was clothed, but the spirit went almost naked; the whole character, both good and bad, was exposed. Hence there was wanting that

morbid sensitiveness concerning mental and moral peculiarities, concerning vice or weakness or spiritual deformity, which necessarily comes of concealment. In such a condition of society, it is easy to understand how every one, being fully conscious that his own peculiarities are freely exposed to the gaze of his fellows, would naturally join in the laughter which they excite, and the laughter would thus become good-humored and kindly. Thus, in Shakspeare, we find the nature, both good and bad, fully exposed; the peculiarities, the follies, the weaknesses, the mental and moral obliquities in each character, displayed in the most amusing light, but mingled with some redeeming traits. We laugh, but it is a kindly, good-humored laugh, in which the characters themselves seem to join. The effect of the whole is not only to agitate the diaphragm, but to warm the heart; not only to create amusement, but to cultivate charity for the foibles, the weaknesses, and even the vices of our fellow-men. In the course of the next two centuries, however, society becomes more and more artificial, manners and opinions less and less free and unrestrained. Every man now clothes, and strives to conceal the nakedness, not only of his person, but of his character. Every weakness is carefully concealed; vice walks in the garb of virtue; hypocrisy, charlatanism, and deceit of every kind abound. According to Carlyle, the whole eighteenth century was hollow and false, *an age of splendid shams.* In such a condition of society, comedy becomes satirical. Its function is now to tear off the mask from society, and expose its deformity. At such exposure, we laugh; but it is no longer the kindly smile, but the bitter laugh of contempt, and perhaps even of hatred. Now the most essential condition of a true and noble art is its *perfect freedom.* Art must be itself its own supreme object; it must be subordinate to no object or end but its own beauty and perfection. Hence Schiller very appropriately calls the impulse under which a work of art is created "*play impulse;*" thus indicating

the perfect freedom and harmonious action—the play—of the human spirit in art, in contrast with its more or less constrained action—work—in other departments of human pursuit. Now Shakspeare, in his comedies, has no other object in view but the presentation of a varied and beautiful picture of society; but the French comedy has some other supreme object in view, either the gratification of spleen, or the reform of society. In either case, the freedom of art is necessarily trammelled, and its beauty impaired. Again, for the full developement of art, particularly dramatic art, there must be a certain degree of freedom in *society*. Not only must the play of the human spirit be free, but the material upon which it operates must be plastic. As loose and imperfect clothing is necessary to the free action and symmetrical developement of the body, so a certain freedom of manners and opinions—not license, but a sense of freedom from constraint—is necessary to the developement of the human spirit into forms of the greatest beauty. Public opinion, law, religious conscience; in a word, *a sense of sin* and *fear of its consequences*; binds and oppresses the human spirit. Hence, freedom from this oppressive sense and dreadful fear is absolutely necessary to the highest developement of art. But this freedom may be the result of two causes, viz., unconsciousness of sin, and deliverance from sin. Thus, a certain childlike unconsciousness of sin is favorable to art; asceticism, or the oppressive sense of sin and human depravity, is unfavorable, but pure Christianity is, again, favorable. The spirit of asceticism is the spirit of bondage, the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of freedom. Thus the almost complete unconsciousness of sin, and the absence of any oppressive fear of the gods, among the Greeks, gave rise to a free joyousness of nature, and symmetrical developement of spirit, and these, in their turn, to that wonderful art which has ever since formed the object of emulation and the model of imitation. The Romans, on the contrary, were oppressed by a sense of sin and reli-

gious obligation—by a slavish fear of the gods unknown to the Greeks; and the Roman civilization was thus a fitting preparation for the coming of Christ, who was to give deliverance. The Romans, therefore, never produced any great native art. Art again flourished in Catholic Europe, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, and from the same cause, viz., an imperfect sense of bondage of sin. The Puritans again brought back the distressing consciousness of sin, and with it the decline of art. With the advance and spread of a true and liberal Christianity, however, the human spirit will again be released from bondage, into the glorious freedom of Christ, and a great art, a true Christian art, will again spring up and flourish. "I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died;" but, blessed be God, we are again made alive and free through Christ.

8. "*The novel*" is in many respects like "the drama." Both are intended as a picture of human life; natural, and, at the same time, more or less ideal. The ideal element, however, would seem to predominate in the drama. The drama is farther removed from ordinary life than the novel; as, in fact, indicated by its very form, the language being in the form of poetry, instead of prose. The very fact of action bringing out the sensuous and emotional element more vividly, renders a strong infusion of the æsthetic, or ideal, element absolutely necessary to constitute it a true work of art. The novel is, therefore, lower in its position, as a form of art, than is the drama; but, at the same time, it has a wider range of usefulness. It may be used as the vehicle for the conveyance of knowledge, for the inculcation of philosophic views, or the institution of reforms in morals and politics. Thus the novel has a range of usefulness outside of art proper. It is only as a work of art, however, that we shall treat of it here. As already stated, every species of subordination of art to other purposes, whether philosophic, moral, or political, cramps the freedom of art,

and necessarily impairs its beauty. Perfect freedom is an essential condition of art; and, therefore, whoever executes a work of art for any distinct purpose, to him higher than art itself—from any motive stronger than the love of beauty—must be content to sacrifice a portion of its intrinsic excellence as a work of art. A work of art, to be really great, must be executed for itself alone. It may contain profound philosophic and moral reflections; it may contain much religious truth; but it must not be executed for these purposes. It must exhibit these things to the reflective mind, as nature does, unobtrusively; the appreciative, thoughtful mind will receive the lesson all the more willingly for having, as he supposes, *found it himself;* the inappreciative and thoughtless sees nothing—his peace is not disturbed by having what he does not understand or care for thrust upon him "against the stomach of his sense." As soon as art becomes didactic, it not only loses much of its value as art, but even much of its power of teaching the truly appreciative mind, although it may become thereby more efficient as a teacher of the popular masses. Now, much of the novel-writing of the present day has been thus subordinated to purposes of moral or social reform. It is for this reason that Mr. Dickens's later novels, as works of art, are inferior to his earlier ones. In his "Bleak House," for instance, his object is to expose the abuses of law processes, particularly in chancery suits, together with other subordinate objects, such as the exposure of the cant of that philanthropy and charity which has its seat in the head, and not in the heart. In his "Little Dorritt," his main object is to expose the abuses of Government, and the horrors of Debtors' prison. Of course, as there is a distinct purpose to be subserved, caricature takes the place of true delineation of life and character. No one can blame Mr. Dickens for this; for to him social reform is a worthier field of activity, or a field for which he is better qualified, than high art. All we wish to say is, that in every such work, true art is

in a measure sacrificed. Now, it is only of *the novel as a work of art* that we wish here to speak.

To most readers, the charm of the novel is the complete absorption of every faculty of the mind in the interest of the narrative. The novel is supposed to be successful, when we are hurried along in a state of breathless suspense, the excitement increasing at every step, until we reach the conclusion; when the intricacy of the plot is so great, and the interest of the incident is so intense, that, with a sort of ravenous appetite, and an eagerness bordering on fierceness, we actually devour the story; when the glowing descriptions, and the delirium of passion, shall steal away the senses, and, "in a sweet madness, rob the mind of itself," and like the ravishing song of Circe, "take the prisoned soul and lap it in Elysium." Can the bowl of Comus be a more intoxicating draught than this? Can this be the object of the "novel?" Far from it. On the contrary, in every such case the novel has entirely failed of its true object; it depraves and prostrates, instead of purifying and invigorating. It is characteristic of a true work of art, that the use of it *bears repetition ad infinitum.* No work of art is worth contemplating at all, unless it can stand this test, and even improve under it. No piece of music is worth hearing at all, unless it is worth hearing many times. No painting is worth seeing at all, unless worth seeing many times, and with increasing interest. No drama or novel is worth reading at all, unless worth reading many times. We mean, of course, as a work of art. A novel may contain good history, or good science, and may be worth reading once on that account; but, as a work of art, it must not only be worth reading the second, but even the tenth or twentieth time, and always with increasing pleasure. We say, with deliberation, *increasing* pleasure; for, even in the best novels, the excitement of the mere story, on first reading, is somewhat too great for the perfect freedom of the mind. It is only in memory, or on repeated readings, that the true

æsthetic impression is complete. Every appreciative reader knows that the pleasure derived from Shakspeare's dramas and Walter Scott's novels rises in purity and in dignity with every reading, and just in proportion as we become more familiar with the incidents of the story, and the lower pleasures of curiosity and excitement become less. The pleasure may become *less and less intense*, but certainly higher and purer. Alas! is it not a law of our nature that those pleasures which are most intense are also the lowest, and those which are highest and purest are also weakest?

We see, then, that in the novel, as in the drama, and in fact in all art, our whole nature must be impressed; but in such manner that the mental harmony is insured—the æsthetic condition is produced. This, then, becomes a test of the perfection of a novel as a work of art. In this respect, we find the German and the French novel are complete extremes. In the French novel, the intense, passionate interest of the story, and the extreme ingenuity in the construction and the disentanglement of an intricate plot, are the *sine qua non* of art. In the best German novel, on the contrary, the plot is so simple, and the incidents so commonplace, as to be unbearably tiresome to the mere ordinary novel-reader; the whole genius of the writer is shown in bringing out the noble and the ideal, even in this common picture; in introducing in the most natural manner, thoughts and sentiments which touch the highest faculties of the mind and soul. In the French novel, the true end of art is lost sight of in the attempt at emotional effect; in the German, the highest end of art is recognized, indeed, but the best means of attaining that end is not understood. The former is intoxicating; the latter, tame, cold, and repulsive to a large class, whom they might benefit. In Walter Scott these extremes are more perfectly united than in any other novel-writer. His novels, therefore, we conceive to be the best type of this species of art which we have in any language.

It becomes now easy, too, to judge how much of truth there is in the criticism on various schools of novel-writing, and of art generally. Madame De Stael, in her admirable work on Germany, though she bestows the highest encomiums on German character, German Philosophy, German Poetry and Music, can not do justice to German Drama and Novels, particularly the latter. The reason is quite evident. Her criticism is really acute and fine. Every word is true from her point of view; but her point of view is essentially different from that of the German. It is essentially French. She looks upon the intense interest of the story—the passionate and emotional effect—as the most essential element in the novel, without which it fails of its object, since it must fail of getting readers. It may be so to the giddy and volatile French, but not to the patient and thoughtful German. Her criticism, as addressed to the French, and having for its purpose the opening of German literature to her own people, may be good; but as philosophic criticism of art, it is superficial.

Again, Dickens has been held up, in his best novels, by some, as the type of the novel-writer. In illustrating this subject, we shall not scruple to compare the drama and the novel, since they are so similar. In comparing, then, Dickens with Shakspeare, while both are admitted to have depicted nature with wonderful accuracy, yet they are, in some respects, the very antipodes of one another. Dickens, in his best novels, depicts nature with an accuracy so minute, that it may well be called a daguerreotype. But the very fact of the imitation being thus minute—the very fact of its being a daguerreotype—is an index that it is only *common nature, i. e.*, nature as seen by common eyes, and addressing the lower faculties—the very nature which every one may see around him every day. Shakspeare, on the contrary, less prolix and minute, is even more true to nature; but it is no longer nature as seen by common eyes, but high, ideal nature—nature as seen by the highest genius, and

teaching the noblest lessons. This high, pure, truly wonderful ideality of Shakspeare, is best seen in his female characters. These are, at the same time, perfectly natural, and attaining an otherwise inconceivable ideal. Dickens is, therefore, the extreme of simple naturalness, in the common acceptation of the term—Shakspeare, of the highest conceivable ideality combined with perfect naturalness. Again, the very manner in which the characters are constructed, in each case, is equally characteristic, and suggestive of the essential difference in the genius of the two. The process is, as it were, *inductive* in the former case, and *deductive* in the latter. Dickens commences *ab externo*, with the minutest details, and proceeds step by step until every detail is exhausted; and then only is the character, in its true nature, seen and understood. Shakspeare, on the contrary, commences, as it were, *ab interno—with the living principle.* The very first words spoken by any character, reveals the true nature of that character to the appreciative, reflective mind; and all that comes after is but the more perfect developement of that character under various circumstances. In the former, the character is built up, stone by stone, *like an edifice*—in the latter, we are introduced at once into the innermost sanctuary of nature, and shown the *living germ*, and then permitted to watch this germ while it gradually expands and clothes itself in forms of beauty. What is this but true *creative* genius?

Now, in every respect, Walter Scott stands between Shakspeare and Dickens. He is more *ideal*, as well as more truly *creative*, than Dickens—though in both respects inferior to Shakspeare. We have already said, however, that there is an essential difference in this respect between the Drama and the Novel. It is not improbable, therefore, that Walter Scott, in his novels, has attained the highest position possible in this department of art. He, therefore, is for us the type of the novelist.

9. If any department of art is purely imitative, surely it is "*Portrait-Painting:*" and yet we know none which illustrates the principles previously laid down better than this. It is generally supposed that the portrait-painter is successful in proportion as he reproduces, with mathematical accuracy, the outline and color of every feature; so that the man himself, exactly as we usually see him, lives before us. If so, then portrait-painting has become an entirely useless art; for the daguerreotype is infinitely superior in every thing but color. If so, then Genius has become an useless faculty; for it is far outstripped by sunlight. The art of Photography is an absolutely perfect imitative art. Even microscopic details are reproduced with almost inconceivable accuracy. Yet who does not feel that the pleasure taken in photographic pictures is essentially of a low kind, compared with the pleasure we take in a work of real fine art. Now, what is the reason of this? It evidently is not owing to the absence of color, for this may be very successfully added to the photograph. We explain it thus:

Our nature is a strange mixture of the high and the low—of the divine and the bestial—of the heavenly and the earthy—well expressed in the beautiful outlines of Retzsch, by the Sphynx, with its animal body buried in the dust, and its divinely-human head encircled with clouds. The whole of this mixed nature is expressed in the human face; the several elements in various proportions, according to our original individual character or degree of culture, but in all, under ordinary circumstances, the lower and sensuous too strong—the higher and the divine too weak. In too many, alas! the divine is so obscured by the animal—so eclipsed by the sensuous—that it seems gone for ever. It exists, however, even though invisible to us, otherwise the face would no longer be human. There is not a human face, however revolting, there is not a human character, however degraded, but has something in it worthy of *love*,

yea, even of *reverence.* If *we* can not see it, it is our own fault. God sees it, and compassionates its fallen condition. It is the business of genius, amid all the infinite obscurations of inherited depravity—amid the still sadder obscurations of individual vice and passion, to detect, bring out, and embody it in art—to disentangle and separate the gem from its dross, and exhibit it in its true brilliancy. In a state of repose, or mental vacuity, only the low, the sensuous, and the animal is visible. The eye must be kindled, the whole face lighted up by noble emotion—by sublime thoughts and high and holy purposes—ere the divine is visible. Now, it is impossible that photography should take the human face except in repose—not the noble repose of conscious strength, but of mere mental vacuity. Any attempt at expression becomes an affectation, and, therefore, worse than mere vacuity. Thus the photograph is impotent to express all that is highest in our spiritual nature. The highest ambition of the imitative artist, like the photographist, is to daguerreotype the face—to make an exact copy of all that a clown might see, or a mechanic, with a rule and compass, might execute. The great artist, on the other hand, may be less minutely accurate in the exact flesh-tint—in reproducing every wrinkle and pimple of the skin, or every fold of the cravat; but he will catch the divine expression—the seal of the spirit. Whatever is low, base, sensual, animal, he will even soften; and whatever is noble, he will make nobler. He does not violate nature, but only *carries out what nature intended.* It is we ourselves who violate nature, through sin, and then call by that sacred name the monster which thus results. The true, but unattainable ideal of portrait-painting, then, is the clear vision by the artist, and the complete expression on canvass, of an individual human character, not exactly as it is, but as it should be—as God intended it to be, and as it would have been if it had not been marred and deformed by sin. A spark of Divinity assumes individual

character, and takes up its abode in human form. Untrammelled, it moulds that form into a perfect image of its own essential nature—but alas! sin has defaced and obscured the divine image. It is the duty of art to restore the image in its completeness, without affecting, in the slightest degree, the perfect and distinctive individuality. What a teacher would such a portrait-painter be!—to see ourselves such as God intended we should be, and such as we might have been, and such as through much conflict we may still hope to be; and then to see ourselves such as we are, through sin. "To look on this picture, and then on that!!"

This is the ideal, but, as we have already said, the unattainable ideal of art. All that we can expect is some distant approach to this ideal; all that we can hope is that the artist shall watch his opportunity, shall skillfully draw out from its deep sleep within the inmost recesses of the soul, whatever is noble and divine, so that it may for a moment flash upon and enlighten the features; and then embody this upon canvass—in other words, shall paint the face when under the influence of noble emotion, when it expresses the highest conditions of the soul. This is the best idealism which we find in portrait-painting. But even this is very rare, for much of what is called idealism is utterly false and worthless; and not only so, but infinitely hurtful, through the discredit which it throws upon true idealism. It sees not, and therefore can not embody, the divine; but it only sees, or imagines it sees, something which it mistakes for the divine, but which has no existence except in its own imagination, and this miserable shadow it strives to embody. The difference between the two is perfectly clear. The false is full of affectation, vanity, and conceit, for it is occupied only with its own vain imaginings; the true is full of reverence, awe, and self-forgetfulness, for it is in the presence of the divine. The former, in its execution, is dim, shadowy, and uncertain; a mere patch-work, without central unity, a mere piece of deliberate *composition;* the latter em-

bodies only what actually exists, and what it clearly sees, and is therefore firm and certain—a work of art possessing unity, because embodying a distinct idea.

There are, therefore, three classes of portrait-painters. The first honestly, faithfully, and accurately sets down all that he sees, but he sees only the low and commonplace. The second equally honestly and faithfully sets down all that he sees; but he sees also the noble, the divine—sets down honestly all that he sees, only varying their relative strength; here softening, there strengthening, until all is brought into divine harmony; not in the spirit of dishonesty and deceit, but as a faithful and loving teacher. The third, despising the first class, and not able to attain to the second; leaving the firm basis of mechanical execution, and not able to attain to the divine conception; loosing his firm grasp of the *actual* and material, and not able to take hold of the *ideal*, merely floats about in a cloud-land of vain imaginations and foolish conceits. The first is low art; the second, high art; but both genuine, and therefore useful; but the third is simply false, and therefore hurtful. The second, *i. e.*, high art in portrait-painting, in its purity, is so exceedingly rare, that most of us would, probably, prefer an error on the side of mechanical accuracy in representation of the commonplace, rather than on the side of imperfect and somewhat false idealism. The tendency to false idealism is so strong in the present age; it is so difficult for the artist to be convinced that he should set down nothing but what he distinctly sees—it is so easy to mistake his own imaginings for the divine ideal—the danger is so great that, if he relaxes his grasp upon the common, he will only catch at a shadow—that really we had much better be satisfied with the accurate representation of our friends in their common, every-day faces. Love is closely allied to genius. Love, like genius, enjoys the privilege of seeing the noble, the Godlike, in the human face, however obscured by the veil of material clothing, and darkened and defaced by sin.

Thus the faces of our loved ones become indissolubly connected in our minds with what is noblest in their character. Thus, if we only have a faithful copy, even of what is most commonplace; if we get a faithful copy of the *material abode, even in ruins*, and, therefore, no longer an accurate image of the divine; yet we have so often associated together in our minds the beautiful spirit with the ruined abode, that the latter becomes at once the index and sign of the former, and love does for us exactly what art strives often in vain to accomplish—transfigures the human face into the image of the divine.

Thus we may, with justice, prefer a pure imitative art, such as photography, in the representation of *our friends*, but this is because we are ourselves, through love, in the position of the high artist; because, in this department of art, our perceptions are so acute that it would require almost superhuman genius to satisfy them, and therefore we prefer that imitative art should furnish only the material upon which *we* may exercise our own *creative power*.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

ARTICLE II.

THE PEOPLE AND LANGUAGES OF WESTERN AFRICA.

Western Africa, in the modern and general acceptation of the term, embraces all that portion of this great continent lying between the Atlantic ocean on the west, and the Kong and Sierra del Crystal mountains on the east, and extending from the southern borders of the Great Desert, in the sixteenth degree of north latitude, to the Portuguese colony of Benguela, in the same degree of south latitude. The whole length of this region, following the line of the sea-coast, is about three thousand five hundred miles, whilst its breadth is no where, except in the northern portion of it, more than three hundred and fifty miles. It embraces more than one million square miles, and has a population, it is supposed, of at least twenty-five millions. Extending over so many degrees of latitude, it necessarily embraces a great variety of climate, soil, natural products, etc., which it is not consistent with the design of this article to consider at length.

This region of country is usually described under the three well-known divisions of Senegambia, Northern or Upper Guinea, and Lower or Southern Guinea, a distinction that is founded not more on the geographical outlines of the country than upon the peculiar character of the people by whom these different districts are inhabited. Senegambia extends from the southern borders of the Great Desert to Cape Verga, in the tenth degree of north latitude, and interiorwards to the distance of six or seven hundred miles. It is watered by the two great rivers Senegal and Gambia, from the combination of the names of which it derives its peculiar denomination. Northern Guinea extends

from Cape Verga, on the north, to the Kamerun mountains on the Gulf of Benin, and is separated from Northern Central Africa by the Kong range of mountains.* It is intersected, in the southern portion of it, by the great Quorra or Niger river. Southern Guinea extends from the Kamerun mountains to the sixteenth degree of south latitude, and is separated from the unexplored regions of Central Southern Africa by the Sierra del Crystal range of mountains. It is divided into two nearly equal halves by the Kongo river, the third great river of the continent of Africa.

At various points along the sea-coast there are a number of English, French, Dutch, Portuguese, and American settlements, none of which, however, except Liberia and the British colony of Sierra Leone, are any thing more than trading establishments, or naval and military stations. Liberia, as is well known, is made up of free colored persons, or emancipated slaves, sent from this country. This population does not, at the present time, amount to more than ten or twelve thousand, scarcely as many as the whole number sent there from this country in the last forty years. Sierra Leone is composed almost wholly of recaptives, and taken, as they have been, from all parts both of the eastern and western coast, the present population is a sort of medley or amalgamation of all the various tribes and families of the whole country. The European inhabitants at these different settlements compose but an insignificant portion of the population of the country, but they are brought into commercial intercourse with the representatives of almost every tribe residing between the sea-coast and the mountains.

---

* The term Guinea, according to Barbot, is derived from Genadida, the name of a district to the north of the Senegal, where the early Portuguese navigators first met with the negro race, and they consequently applied this name to all the country southward, being inhabited exclusively by this race. The term was afterwards restricted to the Gold Coast, which was, for a time, the chief seat of the slave trade.

The inhabitants of Western Africa, though usually included under the general name of negroes or Africans, are, nevertheless, widely different from each other in almost every national characteristic, and, as we propose to show, have had entirely different origins.

The inhabitants of Senegambia are made up mainly of three well known tribes, viz., the Jalofs, the Mandingoes, and the Fulahs. All of these are Mohammedans, in distinction from the inhabitants of both the Guineas, who are pagans. One of these tribes, the Fulahs, claim to be the descendants of Phut, the third son of Ham. Whether they can trace up their genealogy to this remote source or not, it is an interesting fact that they have always prefixed that term to the name of every district they have ever occupied in Western and Central Africa: as, Fut-a-Jallon, Fut-a-Bondo, Fut-a-Torro, etc. The inhabitants of Upper Guinea are usually denominated the *Nigritian* stock, and are so characterized from their supposed descent from the negro races who have inhabited the valley of the Niger from the remotest periods of antiquity. The inhabitants of Southern Guinea have been denominated by all modern writers on Africa, the *Ethiopian* or Nilotic family, from their obvious relationship to the ancient families of the Nile. This family, or race, have spread themselves over the whole of the southern half of the continent, including the Pongo and Kongo families, on the west, the Kafirs and the Zulus, near the Cape of Good Hope, and the Swahere and other tribes, on the coast of Zanzibar. The only exceptions are the Hottentots, the Namakwas, and the Bushmen, near the Cape, who belong to an entirely different race, and a small number of Arabs, recently colonized along the eastern shores.

It is not denied that these different races have many physical characteristics in common. Black skins, woolly hair, protruding lips, and most of the distinctive features of the negro, belong to all of them, but under great modifications.

The Jalofs, for example, are intensely black, but their features are more European than African. The complexion of the Fulahs and Mandingoes is much lighter than that of the Jalofs, whilst their features are equally regular, if not more so. The mountain inhabitants, both of Northern and Southern Guinea, are nearly as light as true mulattoes, whilst they have the thick lip, the distended nostril, and the retreating forehead of the full negro. But it is in the close study of their habits, customs, traditions, superstitions, religious creeds, and especially the structure and character of their languages, that the difference in their national characteristics and origin will become more obvious.

It has already been mentioned that the population of Senegambia is made up mainly of the Jalofs, the Fulahs, and the Mandingoes. The Jalofs are found only on the sea-coast, and along the banks of the Senegal and the Gambia, to the distance of a hundred miles from the sea-coast. They are an agricultural people, and depend almost entirely upon the products of the soil for the means of subsistence. The Mandingoes are mechanics and itinerant merchants. They are to be found in all parts of Senegambia, but extend their trading excursions as far down the coast as Monrovia, and in the interior, perhaps, to a still greater distance. In their peregrinations, they establish temporary colonies, where they ply their various arts, so long as there is any demand for the products of their skill. They establish potteries, tan leather, manufacture cotton cloths, and fabricate implements of war and agriculture. One of their most lucrative employments is the manufacture of amulets, (small leathern bags in which scraps of Arabic are ingeniously sewed up,) which they sell to the pagan negroes at high prices. Most of the Mandingoes read and write the Arabic with tolerable ease, and wherever they go among the pagan tribes, they establish schools for the purpose of propagating their faith. In the absence of slates and other writing materials, they teach their pupils to make the Arabic characters in the sand,

or on smooth green leaves. Sometimes they use green leaves for the purpose of transmitting written communications from one place to another. The Fulahs have made greater attainments in general civilization than either the Jalofs or the Mandingoes, but they are an essentially restless, warlike race. They have gradually extended their conquests, until they have made themselves masters of a large portion of central Northern Africa. They are now known to be the same people whom Clapperton and Denham found on the banks of the Niger, and whom they described under the name of Fellatahs. If their conquests be pushed forward as rapidly the next half century, as they have been since the days of these distinguished travellers, they will have acquired the control of every considerable district between the southern borders of the Great Desert and the Mountains of the Moon, and will give an entirely new social aspect to this vast region. Their great object, no doubt, is to extend their faith. What the Mandingoes are trying to effect through the peaceful agency of schools, they are accomplishing by the sword; and, if we may judge from the actual results, much more successfully. None of either of these families, with a few exceptional cases, have ever been brought to this country as slaves. They are restricted by the precepts of their religion from selling their own people into bondage, but are under no restraint whatever from trafficking in their pagan countrymen. The few of them that have by some means or other been brought to this country, have always shown themselves much superior to the common negro. There is one notable case, in the person of Father Moro, as he is familiarly called, who is still living in Wilmington, North Carolina. He is a Fulah, reads his Arabic Bible with ease, and no one can have any extended intercourse with him without feeling that he is much above the level of the ordinary negro. But our object in the present article is mainly with the people

and languages of the two Guineas, and the remainder of our remarks will have exclusive reference to them.

The inhabitants of Northern and Southern Guinea, though constituting two distinct families or races, as will be seen in the progress of this article, have, nevertheless, many national characteristics in common. They are not to be ranked, as is generally supposed, among the lowest grades of the human race. Nor are they to be judged, in all respects, by the condition of their countrymen when first brought to this country, or even by the character of their descendants at the present day. It is an undeniable fact, that the great body of our present slaves came from a poor stock. There are in Africa, as there were at one time among the Indian tribes of this continent, a large number of weak and feeble tribes interspersed among the more powerful, who have always been made the victims of the slave trade. It is not easy to account for the origin of these weaker tribes; but they may be met with in all parts of Western Africa, even at the present day, and are generally found along the marshy banks of creeks, and in other unhealthy localities. Individuals, too, belonging to the more powerful families, who have not the mental or physical energy to render themselves valuable members of society, are often sold into foreign servitude on the charge of witchcraft, or on some other frivolous pretext. Furthermore, when a gang of slaves, taken in indiscriminate warfare, has been brought from the far interior, the native factors on the sea-coast, through whose hands this traffic must pass, are always in the habit of singling out the healthier and better looking women for their own wives. By this process of elimination on the one hand, and of incorporation on the other, the sea-coast stock has been constantly improved, whilst the refuse only has been sent abroad. Occasionally, a turbulent man has been sent away from the better classes, because he could not be managed at home; and this, no doubt, accounts for the fact, well known to the older members of society among

us, that among the native Africans brought to this country in the early part of the present century, there was occasionally an individual who could never be brought into complete subjection; and, no doubt, if the pedigree of those negroes among us, who occasionally evince more than ordinary energy of mind and character, could be traced out, it would be seen that they derived their origin from some such source.

The negroes of Western Africa, compared with the blacks among us of the present day, have much less civilization, and they show little of that benignity and kindness of character, that has been effected in the latter by the influence of Christianity. But they possess more energy of character, more sprightliness and vivacity of disposition, and are by no means chargeable with that proverbial improvidence which belongs to the blacks here, and which ought to be ascribed mainly to their circumstances. On all parts of the coast, the natives have fixed habitations, cultivate the soil as the chief means of their subsistence, have herds of domestic animals, have made considerable proficiency in many of the mechanic arts, especially in the manufacture of gold and brass ornaments, and in the fabrication of implements of war and agriculture, and show not only a disposition, but a decided aptitude, for carrying on trade with the foreigners who visit their country. On some parts of the coast of Southern Guinea, they construct neat and well finished schooner-boats of twelve or fifteen tons' burthen, in which they perform voyages along the sea-coast, to the distance of two or three hundred miles, and with which they might safely pass over to South America, if they understood the art of navigation.

They have no knowledge of the science of government, as that term is understood among civilized men. Nor are there any extended political organizations any where in these regions, with the exception of the kingdoms of Ashantee and Dahomey; and these, there is reason to believe,

are gradually undergoing a process of disintegration. As a general thing, the people live in independent communities, varying in population from four or five to twenty-five or thirty thousand. In some of these, the patriarchal type of government prevails; in others, the despotic; but in the great majority, the democratic form predominates, in which cases the male population, almost *en masse*, enact, judge, and execute all the laws of the realm. Their laws, so far as they have any, have little or no force, except so far as they are sustained by that wise and universal law of Providence, which sets one man's selfishness over against that of another.

It is not easy to give an idea of the religious systems of pagan Africa, or to render them intelligible to the ordinary reader in a single paragraph. The belief in one great Supreme Being, the Maker and Upholder of all things, is perhaps universal. But they have no correct ideas of His glorious character, and never invoke His name, except in a few rare cases of extreme distress. The belief in a future state of existence is equally prevalent, but of course they have no correct ideas of the nature or conditions of that existence. In some communities, a separate burial-place is assigned to malefactors, showing an impression that there is to be some kind of separation between the good and the bad in the world to come. The belief in the existence of evil spirits, is not only universal, but is deeply inwrought into the mental constitution of the African. The only religious worship he ever offers, is directed to these spirits, the object of which is to conciliate their favor, or ward off their displeasure. They divide them into two distinct classes. One of these are the spirits of dead men, and no doubt are the δαίμονες of the New Testament. In relation to the other, they pretend to no knowledge of their origin, but they are held in great fear and detestation, and are probably the διάβολοι of the Scriptures. They offer sacrifices to the former class, and have as much to do

with them, almost, as with the living. But they never hear the names of the other class mentioned without feelings of uneasiness and distress. The inhabitants of Southern Guinea worship the spirits of their ancestors, and not unfrequently have wooden images to represent them, to which they present stated offerings. The belief in witchcraft, and the resort to *fetiches* (charms, or amulets) as a means of defence against it, pervades almost every community on the continent of Africa. Almost every tribe has some kind of ordeal by which persons suspected of this crime are tried, the most common of which is the *red-wood* ordeal.

The natives have no knowledge of letters whatever in either of the Guineas; and until missionaries went among them, it never occurred to them that their languages could be reduced to writing. This will appear very remarkable, when we come to consider the wonderful structure of some of their dialects, where it would seem almost impossible to observe all the nice grammatical changes without a knowledge of letters. Whilst they have no written literature, they have immense stores of what might be called unwritten lore, in the form of traditionary stories, proverbial sayings, fictitious narratives, and fables in endless number, and of the most striking and forcible character. It is one of their most cherished pastimes to have these stories and fables recited on stated occasions, and it is no mean ambition among them to acquire the reputation of a successful rehearser.

Having presented some of the characteristics common to both of these races of men, we might now dwell much more fully upon the numerous points of dissimilarity between them, but this would extend our article to an undue length; and we must, therefore, restrict ourselves to the consideration of their languages alone, which, however, will be sufficient to show that the two must have had entirely different origins.

In both of these sections, the number of dialects is very great, but in either case it can easily be shown that they all belong to one family; that in Upper Guinea being known as the the *Nigritian* family, and the one in Lower Guinea as the *Ethiopian*. In both cases, the different members of the same family diverge very widely from each other; but there are certain family resemblances which can not easily be mistaken, and always show to what family they belong. The easiest and most satisfactory way of exhibiting the contrast between these two languages, is to single out one dialect from each, and make them the subject of comparison; and for this purpose, we select the Grebo dialect, spoken at Cape Palmas, in Upper Guinea, and the Pongo, or Mpongwe, spoken at the Gaboon, in Lower Guinea. These two points are more than twelve hundred miles apart, and the people, respectively, have no knowledge of each other or of their languages.

The Grebo dialect, regarded in a general point of view, is just such a language as one might naturally expect to find among a rude and uncultivated people. It is harsh in sound, abrupt and indistinct in enunciation, abounds in inarticulate nasal and guttural sounds, has but a limited vocabulary of words, admits of but few grammatical inflections, and is capable of expressing only the simplest and most rudimental ideas. The great majority of its words are monosyllables, and are distinguished from each other, in a great many cases, simply by intonation. Some of its words are so purely nasal, that they can not properly be represented by any combination of letters whatever. The word for five, for example, is represented by *hmu*, but this is a mere arbitrary representation. In common conversation, three or four words are jumbled together, as if they were but one, and in such cases, it is almost impossible for a foreigner to repeat it so as to be understood, The phrase, *hani na nyene ne*, "what is your name?" belongs to this class; and very few foreigners have ever been able to ask this

question so as to be understood by the people themselves. Many monosyllabic words, while having very different meanings, are sounded so much alike that it is almost impossible for a foreign ear to discern the difference. In the monosyllabic character of its words, and the use of intonations to distinguish between them, the Grebo is much like the Chinese; but this resemblance, no doubt, is purely accidental. It is possible that, in comparison with the other dialects of the same family, it may have this feature in excess. As has been mentioned above, the Grebo admits of very few grammatical inflections. In the great majority of cases, the plural form of the noun is scarcely distinguishable from the singular; and when any change at all takes place, it is simply in the final vowel; thus, *blli*, cow; plural, *bllĕ*, cows; *hyah*, child; plural, *hyĕh*, children; *blablĕ*, a sheep; plural, *blable*, sheep; etc. The Grebo has very few adjectives, and those few have neither number, declension, nor degrees of comparison. The want of an adjective is constantly supplied by circumlocution; thus, instead of saying, he is hungry, or is a hungry man, they say, *kanu ni nâ*, *i. e.*, "hunger works him." The Grebo verb has but very few inflections, except to indicate a number of specific periods, both past and future. It has one form for what has occurred to-day, another for what occurred yesterday, and a third for what occurred at any period anterior to yesterday; and so in relation to the future. As a general thing, it relies upon the use of auxiliary particles to express the completeness or incompleteness of an action. The ground form of the verb itself admits of very few changes. All the changes that take place, either in the verb or the noun, are on the final syllable, and never on the incipient. This fact should be distinctly borne in mind, for this, more than any thing else, determines its relationship to other languages. The Mpongwe language, as will be seen presently, makes its changes mainly, though not entirely, on the incipient syllable.

But if the Grebo is just such a language as we might reasonably expect to find among a rude and uncultivated people, the Mpongwe, judged by its own intrinsic merits, would indicate that it was spoken by a people only of the highest culture; which, however, is not the case. In every essential feature, it is the exact antipode of all the dialects of Northern Guinea, and, in many respects, is one of the most wonderful languages that have ever been brought to the knowledge of the civilized world. It is spoken along the banks of the Gaboon river, which empties into the Atlantic ocean just under the equator; along the sea-coast south of the equator, to the distance of two hundred miles, and, perhaps, to the same distance in the interior; and, with some dialectic modifications, across the whole breadth of the continent. The inhabitants of the Gaboon, by whom this particular dialect is spoken, rank higher in civilization than the generality of the people of Northern Guinea, but they can not, nevertheless, be regarded in any other light than as a semi-civilized community. Whilst they have adopted many of the usages and customs of civilized men, they have retained more of what properly belongs to heathenism. The greater part of the men are shrewd and expert traders, and, from long intercourse with English, French, Dutch, and Portuguese traders, have acquired an extensive, if not very accurate, knowledge of these languages.

Their native tongue is remarkable for its beauty and elegance, its clear and distinct enunciations, its complete classifications, its systematic and philosophical arrangements, its wonderful combinations and inflections, and its almost unlimited power of expansion. It is only by a close examination of the structure of the language, and the analysis of its various parts, that we can form any just idea of its wonderful character. We select, therefore, for more particular consideration, the noun, the adjective, the pronoun, and the verb. These will be sufficient to exhibit its more remarkable and striking characteristics.

THE MPONGWE NOUNS.

These, though having nothing to correspond with what is known as declension in Latin and Greek, have, nevertheless, a certain classification, founded upon the manner in which the plural is derived from the singular, which gives them as marked a character as those of either of the other languages.

There are five different modes of deriving the plural from the singular; and, for the sake of convenience, these will be denominated *declensions*, though this term is not strictly appropriate. The first declension includes all those nouns which derive the plural from the singular, by simply prefixing *i* or *si*;* thus, *nago*, house; plural, *inago* or *sinago*, houses; *nyare*, a cow; plural, *inyare* or *sinyare*, cows. The second declension includes those nouns which form the plural from the singular by simply dropping the initial *e;* thus, *egara*, a chest; plural, *gara*, chests. If the first consonant should be *z*, in forming the plural the *e* is not only dropped, but the *z* is changed into *y;* thus, *ezâma*, a thing; plural, *yâma*, things; *ezango*, a book; plural, *yango*, books. The third declension embraces all those nouns which have *i* for their initial letter, and form the plural by changing *i* into *a;* thus, *idâmbe*, a sheep; plural, *adâmbe*, sheep. If the first consonant is *v*, in forming the plural, it is changed into *mp*, as, *ivanga*, law; plural, *ampanga*, laws. The fourth declension embraces all those nouns which have *o* for their initial letter, and change it into *i* to form the plural; thus, *olamba*, a cloth; plural, *ilamba*, cloths; *omamba*, a snake; plural, *imamba*, snakes. The fifth declension embraces those nouns which have *a* for their initial letter, and are the same in both numbers; thus, *aningo*, water; *alugu*, rum; which are the same in both numbers. There are not as

* In all Mpongwe words we use the Continental sounds of the vowels.

many as a half-dozen words in all, included in this last declension. All of the nouns in the Mpongwe language are included in the above declensions, and there are no exceptions or variations, except those mentioned. The following table will exhibit all these classes or declensions, at a single view:

First Declension.

Singular,	Plural,
nago, house;	*inago*, or *sinago*, houses;
nyare, cow;	*inyare*, or *sinyare*, cows.

Second Declension.

egara, chest;	*gara*, chests;
(irreg.) *ezâma*, thing;	*yâma*, things.

Third Declension.

idâmbe, sheep;	*adâmbe*, sheep;
ikândâ, plantains;	*akândâ*, plantains.

Fourth Declension.

olamba, a cloth;	*ilamba*, cloths;
omamba, a snake;	*imamba*, snakes.

Fifth Declension.

aningo, water, etc.;	*alugu*, rum, etc.

These changes, so far as is known, are founded upon no principles of euphony, but are the fixed, original laws of the language. These laws are never violated in conversation—a most remarkable fact, when we remember that the natives have no knowledge of the visible representatives of these nice changes of grammar.

ADJECTIVES AND PRONOUNS.

These two parts of speech are included under one head, because both follow the same laws of inflection. Like nouns, they have number, but no case. Adjectives have regular degrees of comparison, and in this respect they differ entirely from all the dialects of Northern Guinea. The comparative degree is made by suffixing *kwĕ* to the positive, and the superlative by *mĕ;* thus, *nda*, long; *ndakwĕ*, longer; *ndamĕ*, the longest. Whilst adjectives have no case, they have another species of inflection, unknown to any other language of which we have any knowledge, by which they accommodate themselves to any class of nouns to which they may belong. In other words, they have one form for nouns of the first declension, another for the second, etc. This will be better understood by the following table:

First Declension.

Singular.	Plural.
nyare yam, my cow;	*inyare sam*, my cows.

Second Declension.

egara zam, my chest; *gara yam*, my chests.

Third Declension.

idâmbe nyam, my sheep; *adâmbe mam*, my sheep.

Fourth Declension.

omamba wam, my snake; *imamba yam*, my snakes;

Fifth Declension.

alugu mam, my rum, etc.

Here are five different forms, in the singular number alone, for the adjective pronoun, viz., *yam*, *zam*, *nyam*, *mam*, and

wam. In English phraseology, when an adjective goes before two or more nouns, it is not always possible to determine to which it belongs, or whether it qualifies all or only one of them. But in the Mpongwe, the form of the adjective determines the particular noun to which it belongs, with unerring certainty. The personal and demonstrative pronouns follow the same law of inflection; as, *yi*, *zi*, *nyi*, *wi*, *mi*, in the singular; and in the plural, *si*, *yi*, *mi*, *wi*, etc. In English, when the personal or demonstrative pronoun is used, it is not always possible to determine its antecedent; but in the Mpongwe, the particular form of the pronoun determines its antecedent, however widely it may be separated from it. In this respect, it will be perceived that the Mpongwe has an exactness and precision of expression that can be rivalled by no known language whatever.

MPONGWE VERB.

The most remarkable feature about the Mpongwe language, however, is the systematic structure and almost interminable inflections of its verb. As a matter of literary curiosity alone, it is worthy of the closest attention of every inquiring mind. The Greek verb is the most flexible known to the literary world. From a single root, (making no account of changes that merely indicate the number of the person,) between sixty and seventy oblique forms can be derived. But from an Mpongwe verb, more than four hundred distinct, independent forms can be derived from one root, every one of which shall have a well-defined shade of meaning of its own; and is, at the same time, so regular and systematic in all its inflections, that a practiced philologist, after a few hours' study, would be able to trace up any branch of it whatever to the original root. We are sorry that we can not spread out a full paradigm of one of its verbs on the pages of this Review. We will endeavor, however, to give such a view of it as will enable our readers

to form some idea of its peculiar structure, and its amazing flexibility.

All the verbs in the language, except the verb of existence, are perfectly regular in their inflections, and must commence with one of the following consonants,* viz., *b*, *d*, *f* or *fw*, *j*, *k*, *n* or *nl*, *p*, *s* or *sh*, and *t*, each of which has its corresponding or reciprocal letter, into which it is invariably changed in the progress of its inflections; thus, *b* is always changed into *w*, *d* into *l*, *f* into *v* or *vw*, *j* into *y*, *k* into *g*, *n* into *nl*, *p* into *v*, *s* into *z*, *t* into *r*, *sh* into *zy*. The imperative mood is, in all cases, derived from the present of the the indicative, by simply changing the initial consonant into its reciprocal letter; thus, *mi denda*, I do it; *lenda*, do thou it; *mi kamba*, I speak; *gamba*, speak thou; etc.

The Mpongwe verb has all the moods, tenses, and voices that are common to the verbs of most other languages, but it is not necessary to the understanding of the verb that these be developed to their full extent. It has an active and passive voice affirmative, and an active and passive voice negative, also. The active voice, whether affirmative or negative, may be rendered passive in any mood or tense whatever, by simply changing *a* final, into *o*. The negative form, whether active or passive, is distinguished from the affirmative by a certain prolonged intonation on the first syllable, which it has been found convenient to indicate in writing by the use of an Italic vowel when the other letters of the word are in Roman, or by a Roman letter when the other parts of the word are Italics. The following table will illustrate these distinctions, at a single view:

Affirmative,	Active—*mi tonda*, I love.
	Passive—*mi tondo*, I am loved.
Negative,	Active—*mi tonda*, I do not love.
	Passive—*mi tondo*, I am not loved.

* The present tense of the indicative mood is properly the radical form of the verb.

The intonation which distinguishes the negative from the affirmative forms is slight, and at first not very perceptible to a foreign ear; but after attention is directed to it, it can easily be acquired. These four forms should be kept distinctly in mind, if we would acquire a satisfactory view of the full inflection of the verbs.

Having given these general outlines, we may now proceed to the consideration of a still more important feature of the verb. We refer to its *conjugations*, and use this term in the sense in which it is used in Hebrew grammars. Every regular verb has as many as six simple, and at least as many as twelve compound conjugations. The simple conjugations are: first, the radical; as, *mi kamba*, I speak. Second, the causative, which is derived from the radical by changing *a* final, into *iza;* as, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambiza*, I cause to speak. Third, the frequentative or habitual, which is derived from the radical by suffixing *ga;* as, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambaga*, I speak frequently, or habitually. Fourth, the relative is derived from the radical by changing *a* final into *ina;* as, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambina*, I speak to some one higher than myself; to the Deity, etc. Fifth, the reciprocal, which is formed from the radical by suffixing *na;* thus, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambana*, I speak with others; as in conversation, or interlocutory speaking. Sixth, the indefinite, which is formed by the reduplication of the radical, (the initial consonant being changed into its reciprocal consonant, at the commencement of the reduplicated form;) thus, *mi kamba*, I speak; *mi kambagamba*, I speak much without point, at random, gabble, etc. Now, by combining two or more of the simple conjugations, we derive as many as twelve compound conjugations, each of which combines in itself all the shades of meaning of the separate conjugations. Thus, by combining the causative and the frequentative, we get the form, *kambazaga*, which means, to cause some one to speak habitually. By combining the frequentative and the relative, we get *kambinaga*,

which means, to address the Deity habitually. The following table will exhibit all these conjugations at one view:

Simple Conjugations.

Radical—*mi kamba*, I speak;
Frequentative—*mi kambaga*, I speak frequently, habitually;
Causative—*mi kambiza*, I cause some one to speak;
Relative—*mi kambina*, to speak to God in prayer;
Reciprocal—*mi kambana*, to speak to others in conversation, or interlocutory speaking;
Indefinite—*mi kambagamba*, to prattle, speak at random, etc.

Compound Conjugations.

Frequentative and indefinite—*kambagambaga*, habitual speaking at random;
Frequentative and causative—*kambizaga*, to cause some one to speak frequently;
Relative and causative—*kambinaza*, to cause some one to speak to the Deity, lead in prayer;
Indefinite and causative—*kambagambiza*, to cause some one to speak at random;
Reciprocal and causative—*kambanaza*, to lead in conversation;
Frequentative and relative—*kambinaga*, to address the Deity frequently, to be in the habit of prayer;
Frequentative and reciprocal—*kambanaga*, to be in the habit of conversational speaking; much speaking in society;
Indefinite and reciprocal—*kambagambana*, very much gabbling in society;
Indefinite and relative—*kambagambina*, much rambling speaking to the Deity;
Relative, causative, and frequentative—*kambinazaga*, to cause some one to speak to the Deity frequently; to be habitually a leader in prayer;

Indefinite, causative, and frequentative—*kambagambizaga*, to cause some one to speak at random frequently;
Indefinite, relative, and causative—*kambagambinaza*, to cause some one to address the Deity in random language.

In the above, it will be seen that there are six simple, and twelve compound conjugations, making eighteen separate forms, each of which has a distinct shade of meaning of its own. Now, when we remember that each one of these has a separate form for the active and passive voices affirmative, and active and passive voices negative, we then have as many as seventy-two separate forms, each of which can be inflected through all the moods and tenses belonging to every regular verb. It can easily be seen, therefore, how more than four hundred different forms can be derived from the same root; and how easy it is, also, after a little study, to trace up the remotest branch of this extended ramification to the original stock.

It is not pretended that every verb is used, or could be used, in all these varied ramifications; but there is not one of them that is not more or less frequently used by one verb or another; and no matter what one of them may be called into use, its precise shade of meaning will be caught by the native ear, though that particular form may never have been heard before.

The power of combining varied and extended meaning in the same word, as illustrated in the conjugations just presented, must strike every one as some thing very remarkable. The Cherokee and some other Indian dialects, show great power in combining the pronoun and other parts of speech with the verb, so as to vary and extend the meaning of a single word. But the Mpongwe verb varies and enlarges its meaning, by simply unfolding itself according to well-established laws. What can be expressed in English only by a phrase of five or six words, can be expressed by the Mpongwe in a single word. The phrase, "use not vain

repetitions in prayer," is fully expressed in the single word, *agambambina.* Again, the phrase "they held an interlocutory meeting," is expressed by the single word *kambana.* "To lead an assembly in prayer," is expressed by the single word, *kambinaza.*

The Mpongwe language, as might be inferred from what has already been said, is capable of almost unlimited expansion. The vocabulary of words in actual use is not very extensive, which could scarcely be expected of a people of so little mental culture and general civilization. But it has the capacity of very great expansion, as may be seen in connexion with the missionary labors carried on among them in the last twenty years.

At the time just mentioned, the people had no knowledge of the Christian religion, and, of course, had no words corresponding to its technical terms. They had no words, for example, for Saviour, salvation, Redeemer, redemption, faith, etc. But the missionaries, after acquiring an insight into the genius of the language, found no difficulty in pressing into their service words that would express these ideas, and which would be perfectly intelligible to the people, though they had never heard them used before. From the word *sunga*, to save a thing on the point of being lost or destroyed, comes the word *ozunge*, the person who saves it, and *insunginla*, the derivative noun for salvation. So, *danduna* means, to pay a price for the deliverance of a man who has been imprisoned or held in stocks. From this comes the word *olandune*, the Redeemer, and *ilanduna*, redemption. In like manner *iyivira*, faith, comes from the singular, *jivira*, to believe, to confide in, etc. In these various ways, and simply by carrying out the well-known principles of their grammar, the vocabulary of words, in the course of a very few years, has been more than quintupled. It is, and probably always will be, a great mystery to the adult natives of the country, how the missionaries ever acquired such mastery over their language, or how

they have drawn out its amazing capabilities; whereas, it has been done simply by carrying out the principles and laws of the language to their legitimate results.

Where this language originated, or how it has been maintained in all its beauty and purity, by an uncultivated people, for so long a time, are questions that can not easily be solved. We have aimed, in the foregoing pages, merely to furnish the facts connected with its present condition, leaving it for ethnologists to account for its origin, and assign it its proper place in the great family of human languages. We would venture the single suggestion, that the family to which it belongs may have a very remote origin. The people by whom it is spoken have all the physical characteristics now that they had in the days of Herodotus, showing that those characteristics can not be ascribed exclusively, or even mainly, to climate or other external causes. Had they been the results of these alone, there would have been an increasing exaggeration of every peculiar feature; which has not been the case. No doubt the peculiar characteristics of the leading branches of the human family were impressed upon them by a divine hand, at the time of their dispersion. And why may we not suppose that languages of equally diverse character may have been given to them at the same time? It is a fact well known to students of comparative philology, that uncultivated people retain the grammatical forms of their language with much more tenacity than civilized communities. This is owing to the fact that uncultivated men, having no written symbols to aid them, hold on to the original elements of their language with so much tenacity, that they become interwoven with the very warp and woof of their mental constitution; whilst the languages of civilized communities are constantly undergoing changes, for the purpose of accommodating themselves to the demands of a progressive state of society. If this theory be correct,

and it no doubt is so, the language we have under consideration may claim a very remote origin.

But whatever may have been the origin and subsequent history of this language, it is a remarkable providence that both it and the people by whom it is spoken have been preserved for so long a period. If there has ever been a people, of whom it might be truthfully said that they have been *peeled* and *scattered*, it is the African race. They have been carried as slaves into almost every civilized nation, and, from the earliest periods of antiquity, petty wars and internal feuds make up the sum and substance of their whole history. And notwithstanding all this, they have increased and multiplied on their own soil, until, at the present day, they are the largest single family of men, with the exception of the Chinese, to be found any where in the world. When we couple with this the preservation of so remarkable a language—one so well adapted to convey the truths of the Gospel—must it not appear more than probable that God has purposes of mercy towards them that must soon be made manifest to the eyes of the world? Ought not the energies of the Church, and especially of the Southern Church, to be put forth at once, to impart to them the blessings of the Christian religion? Where can a more promising field be found, or where could she expect to reap a richer harvest?

ARTICLE III.

LETTER TO DR. BRECKINRIDGE.

TO THE REV. ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE, D. D.:

These pages are addressed to you, Sir, for several reasons. You had some thing to say, in almost every phase of political affairs, during the time when the old Union was drifting to its dissolution. And we have heard from you several times, even through the thick ribs of the blockade, since the dissolution. You are the accredited author of various utterances on political affairs: a famous debate with George Thompson, the English Abolitionist, I think, at the city of Glasgow, in Scotland; a powerful letter to the "Patriot" newspaper, (I believe that was the name of the paper,) at the same place—both more than a quarter of a century ago; a letter to Charles Sumner, the Abolitionist Senator from Massachusetts, published in the Baltimore "Critic," which I did see; and a letter to William H. Seward, as I understood, which I did not see; and, also, a communication on Know-Nothing Americanism, very strenuously advocating the purposes of that association, in the same religious journal; a powerful letter published in the "National Intelligencer," though not, probably, addressed originally to that paper, in the summer of 1860, in relation to the Presidential election, and the then approaching dissolution of the Union; and the act of the Northern Presbyterian General Assembly, at Columbus, in May, 1862, describing and denouncing the great and guilty sin of the Southern Churches in withdrawing, very schismatically, you thought, from ecclesiastical communion with men busily engaged in preaching the crusade of war upon us. A speech of yours has, also, been seen in "Secesh," delivered in Cincinnati, in the early summer of 1862, in which you are reported to

have said that "it would be better for the South and the North to go back to Jamestown and Plymouth, than peaceably dissolve the old Union." We have never heard it denied or questioned that you are, also, the author of the sentiment, universally attributed to you in the newspapers, as having been uttered at an early stage of the present war, that "it was no matter how much of the blood of rebels, their wives and children, it might cost to restore the Union, the Government was worth it all." For this sentiment, you said, you might be considered a fanatic; and you accepted the probability that it was so. "Perhaps I am a fanatic," you are reported to have said; and you then gave reasons looking to the justification of your strong feelings on the subject, without expressing any apprehension of danger from the guilt of fanaticism, or any repentance for that sin, or any wish or prayer to be delivered from it, if you were guilty of it.

You may wish to know some thing of the antecedents of one who addresses you, as is now undertaken to be done, in this article. I am a Southron, a Virginian, a Presbyterian Minister of the Gospel; a man with, I suppose, about the ordinary sensibilities, sympathies, emotions, and intellect of a man. Of antecedents, in the sense of past honors, to boast of, I have none worth naming; and should feel quite awkwardly employed in boasting of them, if I had any. I have some times, for brief periods, in other days, had the pleasure of your attractive and fascinating personal society; some times the pleasure of hearing from your own lips utterances which bespeak the richest natural gifts of God to mortal man—a masterly intellect, right grandly and royally conversing with the truth of God, and with men and things, and richly enlightening other men by that converse; and still oftener have had the pleasure, and some times the amazement, of reading from your brilliant and trenchant pen what you have seen fit to produce for the public eye. I was a subscriber for the magazine which you

published in Baltimore, the "Literary and Religious Magazine;" a great admirer of your bearing while combating the Abolitionists in Great Britain, and of your letter to Sumner; and have defended quite as much as, on deliberate reflection, my conscience will justify, your two rich and grand, but very crude, undigested, rhapsodical, and dithyrambic books, "The Knowledge of God Objectively Considered," and "The Knowledge of God Subjectively Considered." This is enough to say of myself for the importance, or even for the self-importance, of the subject. I have been so much an admirer of yours in days past, as to be forced, even by the most velvet-footed and unthorough of Southern patriots around me, and by my own conscience, also, to reconsider and rejudge much of the veneration which I delighted to feel in other days for your honored name. Would that you had not compelled it to be so!

When you say that the Government of the old United States is worth any amount of the blood of men, women, and children, and say this in view of, and during the progress of, the present war for Southern Independence, if you have properly weighed the words which you employ, you must mean that any amount of bloodshed is preferable to a peaceable separation of the old Union into two federal Unions, each of respectable size and power; each, as has been proven so far, able to maintain itself against any power which may be brought into the field against it; and each having institutions homogeneous in themselves, but differing from those of the other. And you must be presumed, in all candor, to have believed, while uttering these words, that the Government of which you spoke, that of Mr. Lincoln, answered the purpose for which the Constitution was established: "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The value of a Government, certainly, consists in its answering these and similar purposes, and not in the

names of its founders, or in the pretended attachment to it of those who deliberately defy it for a long series of years, when it would restrain their own partisan lusts, and love it only when it becomes the instrument of the oppression and ruin of their adversaries. And yet it seems hardly possible to suppose, in all candor, and in all charity to boot, that any man who has not been as completely lethean, during the last quarter of a century, as one of the seven sleepers of Ephesus themselves, can now believe that the Government of the United States either establishes justice, insures domestic tranquillity, or secures the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. When we read, in the clause describing the purposes of the Government, the words, *to establish justice*, a long and chequered series of events rises to view: the resistance of the Yankee States to the admission of the State of Missouri into the Union, because her institutions were Southern; the constant struggle of those States to lay heavy duties upon the imports of the Southern States, to build up Northern manufactures; the appropriation of nearly all the territories acquired in the Mexican war, chiefly by the valor and the blood of the South, to Northern use and benefit; the appropriation, after that, by the election of Mr. Lincoln, and the triumph of the Chicago platform, of *all* the territories of the Union to Northern institutions; the open infraction, by nearly all the Yankee States, of a clear and distinct provision of the Constitution of the United States, for the return of fugitives from labor; a social war on Southern institutions for thirty years; the election of a sectional President, by a sectional vote, and on a sectional platform; the usurpation of the power to call out a military force, and to increase the regular army, without authority of law; measures of confiscation, surpassing in barbarity what have been known in Europe among the most barbarous nations since the most barbarous ages; and, at last, the New Year's gift, which is

destined for us at the beginning of the approaching new year.

There, Dr. Breckinridge, is just a glance at the manner in which the Government of the United States has *established justice*, for over a quarter of a century last past. You and I both remember most of these things. Your letter to Mr. Sumner, in 1855, proves you to have been then a deeply apprehensive spectator of the gathering storm. Yourself, Sir, and all others under whose eyes these pages may pass, are respectfully requested to reperuse, if it can be conveniently referred to, that eloquent letter of yours, in which, though it is here quoted from memory, it seems to me that you made a very powerful argument to prove to the Jacobin Massachusetts Senator the probable military equality, and perhaps superiority, of the Southern armies over the Northern, in consequence of superior Southern generalship. Of course, you have not forgotten the personal liberty laws of the Yankee States; or the underground railroads; or the violent seizures of the servants of Southern families in Northern cities; or the constant thefts of Southern servants on the borders; or the Abolition riots in the North; or the grand phillipics of your correspondent, Sumner; or the great book of Hinton Rowan Helper; or the sublime raid of John Brown to Harper's Ferry; or the pathetic appeal of Thaddeus Hyatt and the Concord schoolmaster, Sandford, for the honors of martyrdom, because the United States Senate wanted to make them tell what they knew, as witnesses, concerning the John Brown conspiracy. It is solemnly believed that no such series of mingled injury and insult was ever before so long submitted to by a brave and free people, without revolution. And this is the Government, and it is union with such a people as those, the preservation of which you, Sir, a Minister of the Prince of Peace, think is worth all our blood, and that of our wives and children.

One almost shudders at the logical enormity, in turning to another clause of the preamble to the Constitution, and inquiring: Does that Government insure domestic tranquillity, as it was designed to do? The chief magistrate, for the preservation of whose authority you devote such measureless blood, and who has actually taken a very solemn oath, on the Holy Gospel of God, to support that Constitution, has, without shadow of authority elsewhere in the instrument, save in this preambulary clause, requiring domestic tranquillity to be insured, issued an edict from Washington inviting the slaves of the South to scenes which, if they should occur, according to the will and design of that magistrate, would make the situation of Corcyra, in its great historic sedition; or that of Paris, in the reign of terror; or that of a Northern city during the former Abolition riots, in opposition to the United States Marshal; or that of any other country of which we have read, in its worst times of public tumult, as good or better than ours. And we, and those dearer to us than our own souls, ought to die for the maintenance of a Government which thus observes its oath to "insure domestic tranquillity"!

You will scarcely allege that the question, under your valued Government, whether the Federal power has the right to make war upon the States, is an unimportant one in its connexion with the insurance of domestic tranquillity; or that the question was so clearly settled under your Government, that the ablest and the purest men might not honestly differ in their views of it. The ablest and the purest men of the North, if they still have able and pure men in political life, appear to think the right of the Federal Government to regard itself as the instrument of one part of the States, to wage war on the other part of the States, a clear and unquestionable right; as, also, the right of any particular faction, having temporary possession of the Federal Government, to call itself the Union, and to wage war upon all the rights of the people, North and South.

But the wisest and purest men of the South regard both claims as manifest usurpations, the success of which can leave no chartered liberties either in the South or the North. And in confirmation of the Southern view of the subject, the refusal, in the Convention which framed the Constitution, to accede to the proposition there made, to give the Federal Government power to coerce the States, seems entirely conclusive. Clearly, the Federal Government was never the Union, but a mere temporary representation of it. And yet this question of the right of that part of the old Union whose sectional party might have temporary possession of the offices of the Government, to style themselves the Union, and make war upon the other States, can be esteemed an unimportant one, in view of the insurance of domestic tranquillity, by no sane man any where. It appears to be a question, in the decision of which is involved the decision of the whole question concerning the value of such a Government as our old Union. If the States had the right to arrest the progress of Federal despotism, and either shield their people from it, or place them out of its reach, then it was a Government which might have had some claim to the power to insure domestic tranquillity; and, also, to fulfil another clause of the preamble to the Constitution, "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But in that Government which you prize at so much blood, you are perfectly aware that it has become one of the highest of crimes to think on this question exactly as the framers of the Constitution thought, that the Federal Government has not the right to let loose that part of the States who adhere to them upon those who do not: and in the sacred name of Union! And if the States had no such right as this, under that Government, to arrest the progress of despotism, to shield their people from it, or to place them beyond its reach, then it is, with all its boast of liberty and republicanism, by the illusory and juggling perversion of words for the deception of man-

kind, among the worst Governments upon which the Omniscient eye looks, as the earth revolves beneath it; and the greatest enemy to true liberty which it has encountered in all the series of its struggles upon the earth. If the old Constitution provided at all for the prevention of despotism, then the North have overthrown it, in its forms, as well as in its spirit; and the South have maintained it, both in its spirit and its forms. But if it made no such provision, then it was the worst engine of despotism ever set at work among men, though tinselled on the outside, and as much glorified by blind or interested praise as the silver shrine of the Ephesian Diana; and ought to have been overthrown—the sooner the better for the real progress of human liberty. I commend to you this dilemma, between the prongs of which the perfectly obvious facts of the case compel you to enter.

Do you affirm that we had no right to change our form of general government, or confederation? There stand those words in the Declaration of Independence, on account of which it was, as is supposed among us, that the Yankees did not read the instrument to much extent in public companies last July, notwithstanding the unequivocally false interpretation which they have put upon the equality of all men announced in it: "that to secure these rights," (of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,) "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." There may, perhaps, be some escape from the definite and conclusive force of these words, in some minds, produced by being plausibly told that the Constitution could not cease to be "sacredly obligatory upon all, until it was

changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people." This is a part of the language of Washington's Farewell Address, pressed into service after the usual Black Republican manner, of seizing the shallow and superficial sound of some phrase to which a great name is attached, and whirling it about for an argument, until the smallest amount of calm and fair reason, which it never professed, indeed, to be able to endure, at once dissolves it into its true nothingness. By their interpretation, the right of revolution is denied, by the pen of the most illustrious of revolutionists, and liberty is made impossible, by one who intended to make it secure. A Federal Government elected and supported by one section of States, banded together, and having peculiar interests, engaged in the most gross and avowed oppression of another section, having common and peculiar interests, would, of course, never consent to any change of their form of government, by or for the oppressed. And the more flagrant and avowed the oppression of one section by the other, the more definitely certain that no redress could ever arise from "an explicit and authentic act of the whole people," in the sense of the people of the oppressing section, as well as the oppressed. That sense was probably never intended in the words by the illustrious author; but they have interpreted it as they did the word of God, and the Constitution of the United States, and all other chartered and covenanted truth which stood in their way. Could "an explicit and authentic act" of Great Britain ever have been obtained, to change the form of government of the thirteen American colonies? Could an explicit and authentic act of "all the Russias" ever be obtained, that Poland should change her present form of government, to one which should receive the consent of the Polish people? Or could an explicit and authentic act of the Austrian Empire be now obtained, consenting that the kingdom of Hungary shall live under its own laws? As well might we expect the explicit and authentic consent

of the hawk to leave the chickens secure; or of the wolf to give the sheep a free constitution; or of the avaricious man to give chartered immunity to the gold which he desires more than life; or of the highway robber to give guarantees of respect for the rights of property.

You may, no doubt, believe, with devout sincerity, that there is power in the Government of the United States to secure the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity. We entertain, very deeply, and very sincerely, a very different opinion. Let us, then, calmly reason together.

It can scarcely have escaped your memory, that a Force Bill failed to pass the Congress of the United States in the spring of 1861. That one was attempted to be passed, proves that it was deemed necessary by even the party then coming into power. But that want of lawful authority did not restrain the present chief magistrate of that country, either from his famous call for seventy-five thousand volunteers, or from an increase of the regular army by executive edict. It is true that the new Congress was perfectly subservient to the President; or rather, they were more fanatical than Mr. Lincoln himself. They registered his edicts at once; and passed an act of indemnity for his usurpations. They were too busy in preparing for the destruction of the South, to care for their own liberties. They threw them, *en masse*, at the despot's feet. But, suppose the Congress had been worthy of the name of an American Congress; suppose they had desired ever so much to check the power of usurpation at that initial and decisive point; and suppose they had considered that a gross usurpation, as no statesman would have failed to do, in times when reason was on the throne; what power would they have had to do so? The streets of Washington were thronged with fanatical soldiers, making daily arrests of the best and noblest citizens, on the slightest grounds. The venerable chief justice of the United States pronounced that one of them—an arrest in Baltimore, it was—was among the most

flagrant acts of despotism in history. What of all that? The despot had seized the sword. Free legislation became thenceforward impossible. The plea of necessity was urged—the usual plea of despots. Simple letters from the Executive, for the arrest of individuals, (*lettres de cachet*,) which have met with such universal condemnation in Europe, became perfectly common in that Government, and have been to this day. Printing-presses were demolished, and editors imprisoned; all liberty became a farce, even when they were boasting of liberty, and declaring, like drunken sailors, that they were preserving the "mildest Government on the face of the earth." When a written constitution becomes powerless, precedent is a great thing. That act of usurpation is upon the statute-books of the United States. All the waters of Lethe can not take it away. Not only has the despot's plea of necessity been accepted, but the claim of the despot himself, to judge when that necessity arises, has been allowed, and held good. Now, what is your prospect, under that Government, to secure the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity? Other despots may, some day, suppose themselves under the same necessity as the present despots. They may imprison the Republicans at will, according to the precedents which the Republicans have set them. What a howl for *habeas corpus*, and "free speech," and "free press," that would produce among the Lincolns, and Sewards, and Sumners, and Wades, and Hales, and Trumbulls! They love despotism when the other party feel it. They do not erect themselves to so lofty a height of principle, as to see that it is always criminal, even when they themselves get the benefit. They will, of course, think it very horrible when they feel its edge. But if Marius may proscribe the followers of Sylla, then Sylla may in turn proscribe the followers of Marius. If Pompey may proscribe the followers of Cæsar, then Cæsar may just as well proscribe the followers of Pompey. Faction will rise against faction,

and urge the plea of necessity, which has already been accepted, to set aside all liberty. No man can foresee the end. It really seems a mere jest to talk of such a Government as the means of establishing justice, of insuring domestic tranquillity, or of securing the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity.

It is not easy to see what that is, on account of which you prize your Government above so much blood, guilty and innocent. You freely call us *rebels*. So does Mr. Lincoln; so do all the newspapers of the North, which are permitted to exist. For, under your "best Government in the world," as in Austria and Russia, a man may yet speak freely, provided he will pronounce the Shibboleth exactly to suit the Government.

We will not speak now any more of the sovereignty of the States, and of the right inherent in them to withdraw from a tyrannical Government. We will say no more about the principle asserted in the Declaration of Independence, that the just powers of a government depend on the consent of the governed; nor about the right of a free people to alter or abolish their government when it ceases to answer the ends of its creation. You have gotten beyond all those sweet and sacred things of other days, the days of real liberty and prosperity. But you can not have forgotten how the Southern States kept the bond with unsullied faith, while they acknowledged it to be their bond; how it was chiefly their blood which won the honors of that old flag, in wars against foreign powers. Nor can you have forgotten, that by their personal liberty laws, and their under-ground railroads, the Northern States were *perpetual rebels* against that Constitution, while they very specially claimed the benefits which it conferred upon them. They gave very little assistance in the Mexican war, you will remember; but when the question of dividing the spoils acquired therein came up,

"Hark, answering to the ignoble call,
How rises each bold bacchanal."

There appear to be two senses of the word *rebel;* the one, describing those who claim the benefits, and reap the advantages of the government under which they live, but refuse to make the required sacrifices, and to discharge the correlative duties. In this, the really odious sense of the word, we feel that we are in no danger of the reproach. We were loyal till we were almost lost. We appeal to an enlightened world, and to God, the judge of all, for our loyalty, while loyalty to that Government was not treason to the cause of lawful free government itself. The other sense of the word is, one who resists a despot's usurped authority. In this sense of the word, we feel a just pride in being what our would-be oppressors style *rebels.* In this sense of the word, it is common to us with Washington, and Henry, and Jefferson, and with Hampden, and Sidney, and Russell, and with the patriots, the world over, who have won the purest and the loftiest fame among men. We are willing to have it inscribed on whatever monument may chance to appear to mark to future generations the places where our ashes may repose in the earth, that we are of those rebels who, laying their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor upon the altar of their country, resolve to resist tyranny and lawless oppression, until that last resting-place shall receive us. Until lately, the names of such rebels were held in reverence among you. Until lately, the Declaration of Independence, which is the very apotheosis of exactly such rebellion, was reverently read among you every year on the fourth day of July, especially when it was supposed that it would bear the Abolitionist sense of negro equality. But your people seem now to condemn rebellion so strongly, that one would think that, since the election of Mr. Lincoln, they had some how received some new light on the subject, which not only convinced them that the legal withdrawal of our Southern States from their

usurped and despotic Government was a great crime—the very greatest of crimes, indeed—but that John Hampden's rebellion against Charles the First was a very great crime; and that George Washington's rebellion against George the Third was a very great crime; and, in short, that any rebellion, even a rebellion against the god of this world, the prince of the power of the air, the great spiritual liar, and father of lies, would be a very great crime, and loyalty to him a very great virtue.

But perhaps it is because you think a large nation has so much better chance for reputation abroad, and for respect among the nations of the earth, that you set such a bloody valuation upon the Government of Mr. Lincoln. This was one prominent reason given by your present Secretary of State for being opposed to the separation of the South and the North. But it was in the rude days of old that men were honored for their bodily size and sinew, and a bruiser was of more estimation than a philosopher. It is certainly not the case at this day, that nations are respected for either their territorial size or the denseness of their population. If it were so, the Chinese would surely be a far more respectable people among other nations than the French; and the Russians, than the English: neither of which will be pretended. Nor does it seem to us that the Yankee States, from which we have withdrawn, can be greatly suffering, in their own view of themselves, from diminished territorial limits, or dwindled military and naval power. They have, you will remember, with great sanctity, appropriated to themselves and their posterity all the vast territories which belonged in common to the people of the late United States. That must, in time, greatly swell their territorial dimensions.

Moreover, they have several times recently, during the prevalence of rumors of foreign intervention, declared their thorough ability and determined purpose, not only very speedily to crush "the Southern rebellion," but to contend,

by land and water, with any or all the nations of Europe who might desire to interfere to stop the effusion of blood in the present war. That does not look as if they felt themselves to be suffering seriously from territorial emaciation, or exhaustion of resources. Excuse the remark, Sir, but that does not look as if a Christian Minister ought to be willing to shed measureless blood, which he believes to be guilty blood, and, in addition, measureless blood besides, which he admits to be innocent blood, to extend the territorial limits, or to add to the military resources of such a giant people.

But you can hardly be supposed to think that the respect which a nation commands abroad depends altogether, or even chiefly, upon its size, and not at all upon its character. Most of the giants of the mediæval romance were coarse, ignorant, truculent fellows, good for little else than to devour stray children whom they caught, and of whom a dozen were not worth one good Aquinas, or Abelard, or Roger Bacon. Already one minister of the British Crown has denounced the unparalleled atrocity with which your Government has waged this war; and another minister of the British Crown has thought it necessary to warn the friends of constitutional liberty in Europe against the adverse influence of your present example upon that cause abroad. The nations of the earth are hardly so blind as to look altogether to size or resources, in estimating your influence. They are hardly so blind as not to see that, under the old republican forms, you have, like the Romans under the Cæsars, accepted one of the completest of despotisms, not only affecting to claim for itself rightful power over us guilty rebels of the South, our property, our liberty, and our lives; but claiming that thoroughly despotic power in the so-called loyal States of the North themselves, and having the claim largely conceded to them. It is impossible to foresee how the sentiment will be received by so zealous an adherent of the Lincoln Government as yourself—per-

haps in rage, perhaps with a smile of contempt—but it is coming to be believed to be true by many of the wise at the North; and is most clearly perceived as truth by every thinker at the South, whose thoughts there are any means of knowing by the public, that the existence of any legal liberty on this continent, either in the North or in the South, depends on the success of the Southern revolution. You may also see unmistakable signs of the spread of the same conviction in European public sentiment.

Is it on account of the pure and upright moral character evinced by Mr. Lincoln's Government, and by the people who support it, that you think its preservation worth so much of our blood? It may be a mistake, but it can hardly be so, for it was so said in the newspapers, and corroborated universally by the testimony of those in attendance at the Presbyterian General Assembly, and never denied by yourself, as is believed, but rather gloried in, that, in a debate on the subject of missions, on the floor of that body, a few years ago, your own trenchant and influential voice uttered the sentiment, that great efforts ought to be made to send missionaries to New England; that you did not know any country, pretending to be enlightened, where there was so great a lack as in New England of the full, thorough, outspoken deliverance of the Gospel of Christ to the people from the pulpit. You were not then, certainly, fallen very deeply into *Yankeeomania.* And that good witness, it is greatly to be feared, is true.

It has been your high privilege, Dr. Breckinridge, in other and better days, to render eminent services to the cause of pure truth and a sound Gospel, which we can never forget. And even now, we are sad that you have given good ground against yourself, to those who will occupy it with more pleasure, on account of the scenes and events of other days, and the part which you were called to bear in those scenes and events. But in those services, you were not more remarkable and justly eminent for the noble powers of intel-

lect bestowed on you by a munificent Creator, than for a certain moral honesty which scorned concealment and equivocation, a certain "Kentuckyesque" chivalry of mental habit, which no one, who at all knew you, expected to see ever stoop to any sort of meanness or deception. And you have, in your day, had occasion to see and to know a good deal of the Jesuit priests, and of the wily and cunning arts with which they weigh and balance words and actions, to mean one thing or another, as the exigencies of their cause may demand. You have, no doubt, read the letters of Mr. Lincoln's premier, Seward, to Messrs. Adams and Dayton, published a year ago; and the recent circular of that great Northern statesman to the foreign ministers of the United States abroad, not to mention the frequent and influential speeches of the premier on political questions in former days, on account of which he has attained his present eminent position. Have you ever met in your reading, or your experience of Jesuit morality, with a more thoroughly disingenuous mind, on any and every subject, than that of Mr. Seward? Have you ever seen the art of deceiving men with words practised more thoroughly, more skilfully, or more boldly, than by Mr. Seward? It is not believed that you can or will say that you ever have. Your conjunction of excessive admiration with such a man, looks as if Old Honest had made a partnership with Hate-Good; as if Lofty and Low had met together; and Truth and Deception had kissed each other. That conjunction has seriously injured you, without doing Mr. Seward any good. The act which you carried through at Columbus, accusing us of making an ecclesiastical schism, because we did not remain in connexion with a religious body which was fiercely hounding on the civil Government in making war upon us, and because we established a separate Church in the Confederate States, believing that we had, both of right and in fact, a separate civil Government there, had a twang of peculiar Sewardish innocence about it. Our country had

ceased to be free, and belonged to you! The Presbyterians of the South, though unrepresented in your body, had ceased to be the Lord's freemen, but belonged to you! If they withdrew from you, you would disregard their Church organizations, and establish others on the same ground! You would give up none of *your country*—not you! There was far more of Seward than of Breckinridge in that act. Such voluntary blindness to things perfectly visible; such persistent manufacture of coverings thinner than fig-leaves out of human language, to conceal facts, or cause them to glimmer with dimness to men's view, is probably a sign of the sore impending judgments of God upon your people. The faith of man in the words of God, is the means of man's salvation. That faith is among the highest acts of worship which man offers to his God. To realize that facts accord with those words of God, and thus to receive the words as the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen, is about the highest elevation of the spirit of man while in our present bodily condition. Veracity between man and man, is one of the ten commandments given from heaven to earth. The practice of veracity is the basis of moral honesty, and moral courage; some say, of almost all good character. You yourself have taken the distinction, in the titles of your two massive volumes, between subjective truth, or what a man thinks, and objective truth, or that which exists independently of all human opinion. You have, probably, observed how the Northern mind often tries to think a fact out of existence; to shut their eyes to it, whether it be a principle of Scripture, a clause of the Constitution, or a maxim of common good faith and good behavior; to ignore it, to deny totally any acquaintance with it, as Peter did with his Master; and look you calmly in the face, in all apparent good conscience, as if the fact itself had been annihilated by their refusal to recognize it. You have probably observed, and if so, it must have been with alarm, the prevalent opinion among

that people, that there is no difference between objective and subjective truth; that whatever a man chooses to believe to be truth, is truth for him. You must have observed the suppression of printing-presses for speaking unwelcome truths, which it is intended to expel from God's universe, and cause them to cease to be truths, by ignoring them. You must notice how every fact connected with thirty years' social war of the North upon our institutions, is now diligently concealed from the Northern people; and how the most orderly, lawful, and proper revolution in all history, provoked by a train of insult and injury such as no other people ever submitted to for so long a time, is styled "the most causeless rebellion that ever was, against the best Government on earth." This disingenuousness is a very deep and cancerous species of depravity, when it becomes so wide-spread. With all your strong bias in its favor, yet with your natural stout honesty of mind, you must some times see this deep depravity of the Northern mind, or, at least, have startling glimpses of it. It has shown itself as clearly among your military leaders, as in your Secretary of State. General Pope's dispatch from near Corinth, last summer, that he had captured ten thousand Confederate prisoners, and a million of dollars' worth, of army stores, from General Beauregard, in the retreat of that general, has never been denied by any Northern paper that we have seen, although it was a total falsehood. It may not be amiss to put on record here a few other things of the same description, for the eyes of those who come after us, as memoirs to serve for the history of the mystery of the iniquity of mendacity. When Jackson drove Banks and his army from the Valley of Virginia, last June, in one of the most affrighted and perfect routs on record, capturing his immense stores at Winchester, Banks's official report contained these words: "My command has not suffered an attack and rout. It accomplished a *premeditated retreat* of sixty miles, in face of the enemy, defeating his plans, and

giving him battle wherever found. Our loss is, thirty-eight killed, one hundred and fifty-five wounded, and seven hundred and eleven missing." At the very time when this report was published, there were to be counted in Virginia three thousand prisoners, captured from Banks's army on its "premeditated retreat." The defeat of McClellan's army in its entrenchments around Richmond, last June and July, was, as events have since shown, one of the most thorough and crushing defeats on record. The following appeared in the "New Orleans Delta," of the 10th of July: "Great battle fought! Richmond taken! Fifty thousand rebel prisoners taken! The last ditch captured! The Tennessee has arrived from below Vicksburg, bringing the following important intelligence: On the sixth instant, General Halleck sent a despatch to Commodore Davis, commanding the American fleet above, announcing that he had just received a telegram from General Grant, stating that a great battle had been fought at Richmond, with immense loss of life on both sides. Richmond had been captured, after a desperate struggle, and fifty thousand Confederate prisoners taken, with a vast quantity of stores, ammunition, guns, etc. We have no reason to doubt the authenticity of this great news, as it comes through a semi-official channel of a most reliable character. Three cheers for McClellan and the army of the Union!" The capital of the Confederacy may be taken hereafter, for all we know, if God so will, and even before these sheets go through the press; but it certainly was not captured by McClellan last July. Here is another incident, of the same period, involving the veracity of General McClellan himself, and taken from a trustworthy authority: "At Cold Harbor, after the fight was over, a wounded Yankee called to one of our officers, and besought him to tell him what devils had been fighting them, as he had 'never seen such a fight before.' The officer satisfied his curiosity, and, among other forces, mentioned those of Jackson. 'Was that devil *here?*' re-

plied the Yankee. 'Why, yesterday, *McClellan had an order read to the army*, saying that he had been cut to pieces in the Valley.'" (The Italics are ours.) Such is General McClellan's idea of the virtue of veracity. His own address to his army, on the fourth day of July, from Harrison's Landing, from which he soon afterwards made an inglorious escape, will further illustrate that virtue of this distinguished character. It commences: "Soldiers of the army of the Potomac, your achievements of the past ten days have illustrated the valor and endurance of the American soldiers. Attacked by superior forces, and without hopes of reinforcements, you have succeeded in changing your base of operations by a flank movement, always regarded as the most hazardous of military operations. You have saved all your guns except a few lost in battle, taking in return guns and colors from the enemy. Upon your march you have been assailed, day after day, with desperate fury, by men of the same race *and nation*, skilfully massed and led. Under every disadvantage of number, and necessarily of position also, you have in every conflict beaten back your foes with enormous slaughter. Your conduct ranks you among the most celebrated armies in history. None will now question that each of you may always, with pride, say, 'I belonged to the army of the Potomac.' You have reached this new base, complete in organization and unimpaired in spirit. The enemy may at any time attack you. We are prepared to meet them. I have personally established your lines. Let them come, and we will convert their repulse into a final defeat."

These specimens appear to be sufficient. We have no space for the vulgar mendacity of your hero, John Pope. It is equally gross and notorious. We spread these things here, Dr. Breckinridge, under the all-seeing eye of our God and Judge, and ask if this is not the most shameless perversion of truth with which you have ever met any where? They say that these men are required by their Government

to make these mendacious reports. It is vain to say, it is a part of the strategy of war to practise these arts. There is nothing whatever of the sort among the Confederates; nothing! That charge, if made, is as true as these despatches and addresses: not more so, that we know of. And this is the moral character of the Government, and of the cause, for love of which an aged and venerable minister of *God's truth* cares not how much of the blood of rebels, their wives and children, is shed. Oh, Sir, you have, some how, fearfully erred!

It is a grand and solemn fact, that neither a man, nor a party, nor a whole generation of men, can MURDER TRUTH, any more than they can murder God Himself. That discovery will have to be made, some time or other, by your Government and your people, if it is not made already. The giant Enceladus, lying under Mount Ætna, often threatens to arise and shake off the mighty mass of the superincumbent mountain. And some day he will probably arise, although the fabled giant is but the volcanic force of subterranean Sicilian fires, and not a giant of mind and soul. But there can be no conceivable mass of superincumbent falsehood, piled upon the bosom of truth, from under which she can not rise, when God shall so please, as readily as the Hebrew giant from the fetters of the seven green withes, which he broke "as a thread of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire." For God is the life and soul of truth. It is His breath, as immortal as His being, as unconquerable as His right arm. "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law?"

Your Government seems, at length, to have fully set up the claim of right to confiscate the property, emancipate and ruin the slaves, and subjugate the people, of the Southern States. Have you ever seriously asked yourself, as in the presence of the Judge of all the earth, from whence have they derived such right? Was there ever

such a grant of our soil to your people, by express divine authority, as there was of the soil of old Canaan to the Hebrews, under Joshua? And if not, do you think that the invasion of Canaan by Joshua, and the subjugation and extermination of the people, would have been justifiable without the express divine command under which it was accomplished, and that it is a proper model for wars of subjugation and conquest in every age and country? Do you never *feel with* our great ancestors of the first Revolution, while Great Britain was attempting to subdue them? or with Holland, in her heroic story, while the haughty Spaniards were endeavoring to wrest from her her political and religious rights? Have you learned to *feel with the despots*, in all the great struggles for the rights of self-government and unfettered conscience, with which the annals of the human race are bespangled?

Do you profess to derive that right of confiscation, emancipation, and subjugation, from the Constitution of the old United States? The fact that the Union was a union of States clearly appearing before our eyes in the Senate, where great States and small are equal; and that the Constitution was adopted by States; and that the President is elected by States, and not by a majority of the whole people; and that almost every political function, except those which involve foreign nations, was transacted by States; ought to have satisfied the calm reason of every man that the instrument of the union of the States could never have contemplated the subjugation of one part of the States by another part; and the consequent destruction of those powers of voluntary sovereignty on which the Union depended. Logically, the claim to rule by coercion in this country, is a claim to *force* men to a *voluntary* action—one which must be voluntary, in the nature of the case, or else it can not be at all. It is said to be a war-making power. But certain powers are granted to the Executive, for times of war, by the Constitution, and these are not among them.

And all powers granted to the Executive, for all times, are restrained by the positive mandate that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; and that in all criminal proceedings, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

Much is built upon the *insurrection* of the States against the Federal Government. This is a thorough perversion of the meaning of the word insurrection, as employed in the Constitution, as almost any publicist of the old and unfanatical school of any party of the politicians would have admitted. But suppose the present claim to be well founded. Suppose that war removes from the Executive Government the restrictions of the Constitution in regard to the life, liberty, and property of the citizens of States in insurrection, as they choose to call it; then it would really seem as if the obligation of the Southern States to support that Constitution was dissolved also, by the act of your own Executive, in setting aside the instrument as the regulating authority of the war; even if the repeated infractions of the instrument by the Abolition States had not broken the covenant on all sides, by breaking it on their side; and even if our own solemn and legal act of secession and withdrawal had not released us from the moral obligation to support that Government. These considerations throw a lurid light upon the moral character of the war which you are waging upon us. Moreover, if a state of war releases your Executive from the constitutional restraints in relation to life, liberty, and property of the citizens of the States, then, clearly, you only need a state of war, at any time, to constitute your President the completest despot of the world. Surely, men who thus construe a written instrument under oath, are not the men through whom you can hope to secure the blessings of liberty for yourselves and your posterity; or for whom

it is either Christianity or worldly wisdom to spill much blood, guilty or innocent. They are such men as no people can elevate to power without fearful danger, to say the least.

Do you derive the right to subjugate and destroy us from natural justice, equity, or from any law of nature? This you will hardly pretend. The Abolitionists have long contended that the Declaration of Independence gave the negro the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, after the cruel fashion of their States. But even they have not yet advanced theoretically, although they have practically, to the splendid humanitarian conclusion, that natural equity gives those rights to the negro of the South, but takes them away from the white man.

A good deal is said at the present time about the great battle of Armageddon, the pouring of the seventh vial into the air, the division of the great city into three parts, and the dreadful apocalyptic hail. And a blessing certainly is pronounced upon those who wisely read, and hear, and keep the words and things of that prophecy. But there is another much plainer prophecy than those of the apocalyptic seer—a prophecy from the lips of the Lord Jesus Himself—one of those clear foreshowings of the moral destinies of this life, which He frequently threw upon the world—which, taken in connexion with its fulfilments, appears to me to be among the grandest of all prophecies of worldly affairs. It is this: "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." The moral government of God in human affairs, His unwearied and unceasing special providence, and His eternal justice, appear together there in unequivocal form. What a prophecy that is for your beloved Government, to be fulfilled under the just eye and in the due measures of God! And what solemn days are before them, when they shall be receiving full and fair compensation, from Him before whom all truth lies in sharp objective shape, independently of all human attempts to think it down, or to outface it, for their social war of thirty

years against the South, under the stolen guise of humanity; and for their selfish and sectional presidential election; and for their total overthrow of the liberties of the people of the North, and, as far as they could, of the South also; for their intrigue of the Continent into this war; for the oppression, rapine, and murder, which have been committed; for Butler's deeds in New Orleans, for Andrew Johnson's in Nashville, and for Sherman's in Memphis; for all that the cells of Fort Warren, Fort LaFayette, Fort Delaware, and Fort McHenry have to utter in the unerring and retentive ears of the holy, impartial, and almighty God. Your Government may take comfort to itself, that there is little prospect that any earthly power will be able soon to be the instrument of administering the divine justice to them. Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil. Yet, remember that

> "The mills of God grind very slow, but they grind exceeding small;
> And though He may forbearing be, with exactness grinds He all."

God is patient, because he is eternal.* His means of administering justice are as ample as His government is universal. He can and does do, in these days, without miracle, all that He did in former days by miracle. The New Testament dispensation is not one in which the order and plans of His government produce any diminution of the displays of His power in human affairs. The same power attends Him now as when the Red Sea closed on the chariots of Pharaoh, or when the destroying angel paid a visit by night to the hosts of Sennacherib. "Nemesis has always been represented as seeming to tarry, but making her appearance most opportunely at last. When man's passion is strong, and bent upon indulgence, avenging justice may seem as if it was standing aside, and inattentive; but it is only that it may seize him with a more powerful grasp, in

---

*St. Augustine.

the state of exhaustion that follows. When the plots of cunning and deceit are successful, it may look as if God did not observe human affairs; but when the dishonest man is caught at last, he finds it to be in toils which have for years been weaving for him. Napoleon, on his march to Moscow, concluded that he could command his destiny; but when the nations of Europe, alarmed at his ambition, shut him up in St. Helena, every one saw that his destiny had, instead, been all the time carrying him along, as the stream bears upon its surface the bubbles which its waters had formed. It not unfrequently happens, that every opposing power, which the wicked thinks he has crushed, rises up to pursue and punish him, when the tide of fortune is turning against him. Every drop of that cup of bitter elements which he has been filling for others, he must drink himself, when he has filled up the measure of his iniquities. The fagots which he has been collecting for the destruction of others, all go to augment the flame of his own funeral pile. The drunkard is not more certainly haunted by the frightful apparitions called up by the disease which follows excess, than crime is pursued by its avenging spirits. There is, if we may so speak, a gathering and closing in at the death, and that to behold his agonies and humiliation, of all the powers which have been in scattered scent and pursuit of him, throughout the whole hunting-ground of his career. It is affirmed of the drowning man, that in the brief space of time that precedes unconsciousness, every event of his past life passes in rapid review before his eyes; and there is certainly some thing of this hurrying in the avenging events, all having a connexion with his past life, which God crowds on one another, to make the ambitious, the proud, and the malignant, discover that He has all along been ruling their destiny."*

---

* McCosh on the Divine Government, Chap. II., sec. 3.

These eloquent sentences, written years ago, in the tranquillity of Scotland, sound as if they were written for the present times on this continent. Do not think, however, that we are unmindful of our own sins. Far from it. We know that divine justice owes us, and we feel that we are being paid heavily, for pride, covetousness, sensuality, worldliness, ungodliness. We trust that we are, in some measure, humbling ourselves, and coming to repentance for those great sins. But of the dreadful political and social sins, of faithlessness to compacts, and to oaths, and to constitutions, and to Holy Scripture; of falsehood and deception; of inhuman malice and barbarity; we do not greatly dread the inquisition of our Divine Judge. We loved and defended the Government of the United States, until the whole spirit of the bond was perverted by malignant enemies into an instrument for our oppression. While we professed to live under it, we did so with unsullied honor. Our sages made it. Our statesmen administered it. Our patriots freely gave their blood for the honor of its flag, while the flag was an emblem of justice. We bore with the insult and wrong of the Northern States with all patience, until hostility to us became the high road to popular favor among them; and until our patience received their sneers, and was construed into a confession of weakness, and a purpose of submission to the most lawless and fanatical of their meditated schemes of oppression. And we solemnly believe that one of the greatest obstacles to peace is the favorable record for us which truth would make of our great struggle and its causes, if the war should speedily close. We are, both parties of us, in the hands of God. *We* cheerfully leave our cause in His hands. Your beloved Government will one day fall into His mighty hands, whether you will or not.

When you say that your Government is worth any amount of the blood of rebels, their wives and children, how do you estimate the value of that part of the blood thus devoted

to be shed, which even you will admit to be innocent blood? The shedding of innocent blood is the crime to which, of all others, the severest penalties are annexed in the divine law, and put into execution in the divine government. It is forbidden from Mount Sinai, and in the inspired Jewish civil law, and in the laws of all countries. And the penalty which we see to come directly from the hand of God, into the conscience of the guilty man, is the most tremendous in nature. Time does not wear it away, but leaves it plainly exhibiting a nature and a power as eternal as the spirit itself in which it inheres. On the first occasion on which we know of innocent blood having been shed on earth, the voice of that blood was loud enough to be heard from earth to heaven. It cried unto God from the ground. And the earth which opened her mouth to receive that blood, opened it also to curse the murderer. He was denied the bountiful gifts of the earth, and made a fugitive and a vagabond upon her surface. One night a treacherous Jew sold the blood of an innocent man to the chief priests of his nation, for thirty shekels of silver. But before the hour of noon on the next day, the thirty silver shekels were hurled out of his hand as if they burned it; and the bare memory that he had had a part in exposing that innocent blood to be shed, had such fearful power in his mind as to extinguish his ruling passion of avarice, and blot out his hopes of the future, and crush the instinct of the love of life itself, and send his soul into eternity, reeking with the blood of the innocent Redeemer, and with his own blood besides. That same innocent blood, laid upon the souls of the children of God, as the sprinkling of the atonement, is of sufficient value to save unnumbered millions of souls through eternity. Laid upon the guilty heads of those Jews who, upon the day of the crucifixion, invoked it upon their heads, and those of their children, it has burned and withered them, and is now burning and withering them, until, in point of perfect loss of all existence as a people, they are sunk lower than

any other people on the face of the earth. If you really believe that this world is a part of the dominion of God, that His holy, and powerful, and infallible government and providence extends over it, and that might does not make right, and that delay of judgment is no sign that the sentence is either repealed or forgotten, then, indeed, you would better have a care of being found guilty before God of the shedding of innocent blood. Such men as old king Pharaoh, of Egypt, in the days of Moses, and king Herod, of Judea, in the days of the birth of Jesus, and Richard the Third of England, and perhaps a few of the Roman Catholic Inquisitors, have dealt in the blood of children. You are the first Christian Minister in all history known to us to be enrolled in that list, the distinctly and deliberately expressed atrocity of whose sentiments renders any defence of him impossible. We consider our own blood, when shed by our invaders, as innocent blood. And so do you, and so do all men of any thought in Mr. Lincoln's dominions, consider the blood of all other men but ourselves, in similar circumstances, to be innocent blood. Except ourselves, all other men in history, who bleed for independence, and against lawless oppression and injustice, are the greatest and noblest of men. But we presume that no one will question that the blood of our wives and children, which you have already shed, and which you may shed hereafter, is innocent blood. We commit that innocent blood to the justice of that God whose ears are attentive to its cry, and to His almighty power, and to His infallible memory. He keeps the blood of the prophets, and apostles, and martyrs. Vengeance is His. Self-defence and cheerful trust in Him are ours. We accept war just as long as He may permit it to be waged upon us. We feel perfectly clear and certain that, in the strictest and most faithful interpretation of them, the oracles of Christianity give us a full support as to the righteousness and holiness of the war which we are waging. We are not at liberty or at leisure to spend a single thought upon submission to

the Government of Mr. Lincoln. It would be unfaithfulness to God, to our own liberties, and to those of our posterity. Even if we expected to be subdued, we have no alternative but unceasing resistance. But we do not expect to be subjugated. We build these expectations on many things. We know that this is not an atheist world. We know that might is *not* right. We know that no generation of men can destroy the existence of truth by pertinaciously refusing to look upon her fair face. We know that the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. We know that there is a government of God, which can make David stronger than Goliath; that there are times appointed, when one shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight. We pray a great deal for our leaders, for our rulers, for our armies, for our cause. We can clearly see that God is the hearer of our prayers. We commit the events of the future to His disposal. The whole disposal of them is from Him. Moreover, although we desire to do no boasting, save that which speaks in the booming of our cannon, and the sharp volleys of our musketry, yet we do not so trust in God as to neglect the use of the means. We lean ever upon God, and as we consult one with another, we find that He infuses hope, comfort, and cheer into our people's hearts, over the whole land, amid the deepest waters and in the sharpest flames of trial. But we trust also in the brave hearts, and the steady hands, and the deadly aim, and the sharp bayonets, of our soldiers. We trust in the skill of our military leaders, the firmness of our civil Government, and the unflinching and self-sacrificing loyalty of the whole mass of the people. We are placed in precisely such circumstances as were our fathers of the first Revolution. Their example gives us light. Their grand forms, walking in the path of glory before us, appear to beckon and to lure us on. Their reproaches are our reproaches; they were called rebels, just as we are called rebels. Mendacity and barbarity were tried against them, just as

mendacity and barbarity are tried against us; though far worse are the mendacity and barbarity of these times than of those; of Yankees than of English. They maintained a seven years' contest for their independence. It may appear to an all-wise Providence not to be a real good to us to win our independence in a much shorter time. It would be a crying shame to us to estimate our own liberties, and those of our children, at less than seven years, or than any number of years which may be necessary for their achievement. And the final success of our forefathers, together with the long list of splendid victories already granted to our armies, and the answer of God in our hearts, when we commit our cause to Him—these things cheer us. Mr. Lincoln's proclamations have always done us great good. They are enough to beget courage under the ribs of death. They are more than enough to fire the hearts, and nerve the arms of Southern men. They seem likely to continue to perform that office for us.

Of course, we know that war is an immense evil; there is so much precious life lost, there are so many souls sent unprepared into eternity, there are so many widowed wives, and orphan children, such measureless woes of bereavement, such trampling down of Zion, such an arrest of all progress of society. It is a great evil; and upon those who are its authors, in the sight of a just God, it rests as a great crime. But in the hands of God, and in the far-reaching plans of His government, history shows war to have been, in various and wonderful ways, an instrument, also, of vast blessing to the world. We believe that our armies are exhibiting, to a considerable degree, the silver lining of the sable cloud. Their great self-denial and trials have been sanctified to the souls of both officers and men, in many instances. Many in the armies have passed from death to life. We have many godly officers and soldiers. There have been, in our great struggle, not a few instances of manifest divine interposition, and of

evident answers to prayer. It is believed by many that both our armies and our people are approaching nearer and nearer to that state of a brave and diligent use of the means, and, withal, a firm leaning upon God in faith, which will make us as invincible as the armies of Joshua, and by the same power. Heaven grant that it may be so.

Give me leave to tell you, in conclusion, that your Government and your people are laboring under that deep blindness and delusion which are the natural result of crime. You think that your monstrous wrongs against us have either been committed in a dream, or that they are *murdered* truth and *dead* history. You think that, some how or other, with compromise or without compromise, we shall some day have some political union again with you. If you but knew the simple fact on that subject, you would, unless you are in the full possession of the evil one, zealously labor to undo what you are now zealously laboring to do; and eagerly strive, by all the arts of a merely subjective species of truth, to prove yourselves not to be, and never to have been, what you are now eagerly striving to show that you are.

ARTICLE IV.

REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE CHURCH.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE SYNOD OF VIRGINIA, DURING ITS SESSIONS IN STAUNTON, OCTOBER, 1862, BY THE REV. A. W. MILLER, PETERSBURG, VA.

The present may be considered a critical period in the history of the Church. Horrid war has rolled its tide of desolation into her midst, extinguished many bright lights, and greatly crippled her resources. Some have yielded to the temptations of an evil time, and brought reproach upon the Christian name. An extraordinary providence addresses to her an extraordinary call to duty. Straitened in herself the Church may be, but straitened in her Divine Head she never can be. The resources of Jehovah are pledged to sustain her; the influences of the Spirit animate her; ministering angels wait upon her; whilst all the wisdom, all the power, all the love of the Holy Trinity are engaged to uphold, preserve, and save her! The Lord in the midst of her is mighty. His kingdom can never be moved; no opposition can shake it; no internal decays ruin it. The spring of it is in Him who liveth for ever and ever, and hath the keys of hell and death. It survives amidst falling thrones and dissolving dynasties. Other kingdoms decline and perish. But their fall, equally with their rise, only contributes to its advancement. It takes no step backward. Its course is ever onward. For it was founded by its omniscient King, not only in full view of all the multiform hostility it would encounter, but with the fixed purpose of overruling and converting all opposition into instrumentalities for its developement, extension, and final triumph. The bruising of the serpent's head follows the bruising of the Saviour's heel. The kingdom of provi-

dence, with its ceaseless changes, its tumults, its revolutions, its wars, has been put in subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, who has made it subservient to His great kingdom of grace, the design and end of all His works. Hence, the course of nature and the providence of God have, in every age, ministered to the Gospel, preserving, defending, opening before it its appointed way, and propelling it in its onward career over all opposition of individuals, kingdoms, states, and the embattled hosts of the mighty powers of darkness.

These thoughts afford encouragement in this day of darkness and rebuke. Zion shall not always be left to mourn. God is still in the midst of her. He will help her, and that right early. Though He chasten, He will not cast off for ever. He has come to quicken His Church—come to rouse her from her lethargy—come to rebuke her pride, wean her from self-confidence, reprove her for her unbelief, her indolence, her supineness, her neglect of duty, and excite her to call more earnestly upon the name of the Lord, that He may return to her, and show her His salvation.

Will she "hear the rod," and lay its lessons to heart? Will she humble herself before the Lord, and repent of her sins? Will she address herself to her work with redoubled diligence and ardor? Or will she, even under the chastening hand of God, sink down into torpor and indifference greater than before, and slumber over her tremendous re-responsibilities? responsibilities, too, that are greatly increased by the stirring events of our day. The successful termination of the war we are now waging against infidelity and despotism, will place our Southern Church more prominently before the world than ever she has been before. She will stand alone. The eyes of the world will be upon her. Her course will be watched—every act scrutinized by the nations—their sympathies not yet with her, and given only when forced to acknowledge the evident tokens of favor bestowed by her Divine Head, and her signal devotion

to His service. But, above all, the eyes of God are upon her. She has a great work to do. And it becomes her to realize its magnitude, and prepare, in the strength of the Lord, to do it. It is taken for granted that the discipline through which she is now passing will not be lost upon her; that she will come out of the furnace purified; the line that separates her from the world more distinct than ever; her standard higher, her aims loftier, her zeal more steady, her determination more fixed to consecrate to the service of the Master the great resources He has lavished upon her, and to signalize the power of His grace by a devotion more uniform, more intense, more universal, more constant, than has ever marked her history before. Her experience has taught her that sacrifices of one kind or another she must make; and that if she excuses herself from making easy sacrifices for Christ's cause, notwithstanding the priceless benefits He has conferred upon her, His righteous retributive providence will compel His people to make very painful sacrifices for the possession of jeoparded minor benefits, more valued, but infinitely less valuable, than those they had lightly esteemed. She has thus read her sin in her punishment. Shall not this lesson, so painfully learned, abide with her evermore? and the practical teaching of providence produce most blessed results hereafter? As the disasters which, months ago, befell the Confederacy proved the means of arousing it from its inaction, and exciting it to suitable efforts, which Providence graciously owned and blessed, so shall it not be with the Church now? Will she not with renewed assiduity and zeal prosecute her high and holy mission, address herself with greater fidelity to the discharge of her duties, and, in the boldness and confidence of a true faith and love, and in humble dependence upon the promised agency of the Spirit, take a firmer grasp of the appointed instrumentalities, for the ingathering of God's elect, the building up of the body of

Christ, and the complete establishment of the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the earth?

O for a fresh baptism of the Spirit in this, the outset of her new career! Some of those appointed instrumentalities have never been fully employed, not only by our Virginia church, but by the Presbyterian church generally, though again and again brought to her notice, and though appeal after appeal has been made to her to come up to the full measure of her duty. The Church, to this day, continues guilty of culpable remissness in regard to them, and the consequence is comparative leanness and barrenness. The fulness of the Holy Ghost will never be given, so long as the established order of Christ's house is broken down. "No revival of religion can adequately meet the necessities of the Church, which does not restore her ordinances and ministries to their true place and efficiency." And no revival of religion can have any permanent influence upon the Church, which does not tend to produce this blessed result. "It is only in the body of Christ, rightly knit together in all its parts by divine joints and bands, that the Spirit of Christ can do His mightiest works." If the Church will not honor her Divine King, He will not honor her.

I. One great instrumentality appointed by Christ, but neglected by our church, is the office of Evangelist. This is not an extraordinary or a temporary office, but a permanent office in the church, and will exist just as long as there are countries, lands, and settlements, that are destitute of the Gospel. It represents the aggressive feature of the constitution of the church, by which she invades the kingdom of darkness, the dominions of the prince of this world, where Satan reigns supreme. This aggressive feature strongly distinguishes the New Testament Church from the Old. The spirit of the latter was exclusive; that of the former is diffusive. The Jews had no intercourse with any but Jews. They were shut up within themselves. They were

forbidden to go out amongst the nations around them, and endeavor to propagate their religion. For wise reasons, this was made one distinguishing feature of their economy, in order that it might accomplish the design for which God had instituted it. But it is different now. The spirit of the Gospel is not exclusive. Partition walls are broken down. The old economy made the Church stationary, and expected the world to send to it. The new economy makes the Church missionary, and requires it to go into all the world. The character of the one, it is well remarked, was emblematically represented by the bending cherubim on the mercy-seat; that of the other by the mighty angel flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, that dwell upon the earth! The office of evangelist, then, represents the grand, distinguishing characteristic of the New Testament Church. The pastoral office represents the conservative feature of the church, by which the church, after it is gathered, is built up, edified, protected, fed, its energies developed and rightly directed; its members brought more and more into harmony with Christ, adorned more and more with the gifts and graces of the Spirit, and abounding more and more in every good word and work. Both offices are essential to the growth and prosperity of the church, and each is necessary to the other. The office of evangelist is incorporated in our Presbyterian system—has always been there—but it is the sin of the church that this feature of our constitution has been practically recognized only to a very limited extent. These officers are too few, by far, with us. They are our foreign and domestic missionaries. But many foreign missionaries are in reality pastors. We need, not one, but many evangelists in every Presbytery. It is not saying too much to affirm that not a few ministers who are now in the pastoral office have mistaken their calling, and would prove far greater blessings to the church as evangelists, than as pastors. This is proved by the fact

that, when settled, they accomplish little or nothing; but, when itinerating as evangelists, they are signally honored by the Spirit's blessing. Our church has suffered greatly from relying almost entirely upon one arm of her power only. And she will continue to suffer, if the experience of the past lead her not to alter her course. What is to be expected, but that she will more and more decline and droop, if she persists in contravening the appointments of her Divine Head, and ignoring the most distinguishing characteristics of the New Testament Church? The fundamental feature of that Church is its evangelistic, aggressive spirit. And yet, that which chiefly distinguishes the Presbyterian church in our day is the absence, to so great an extent, of the evangelist. How little, then, in this respect are we conformed to the New Testament Church! The great end for which the Christian Church is constituted is, in the name and stead of her ascended Head, to act unceasingly the part of an evangelist to all the world. And this is the appointed condition of her success. An evangelistic church is a flourishing church; and a church which drops the evangelistic character, speedily lapses into superannuation and decay. The cessation of its activity is the cessation of its prosperity. If it ceases to be evangelistic, it will ere long cease to be evangelical, and then it ceases to be a church of God. Not to advance is to recede, and to continue to recede, until it becomes extinct. Let the aggressive feature vanish, and the conservative feature will one day vanish too, for there will be nothing left to conserve. If the office of the evangelist is slighted, the slight will ultimately tell with wasting effect on the office of the pastor. The whole history of the Church affords striking testimony to the indispensableness of the evangelistic spirit to its vitality and growth. The period most marked by the exhibition of this spirit was the primitive, or apostolical. Then the entire Christian community seemed to act under an overpowering conviction of their responsibilities, as the

evangelists of a perishing world. The Redeemer's parting command seemed to ring in every ear, and influence every heart. All seemed to regard it as much their duty to propagate the knowledge of salvation, as to yield obedience to the Decalogue. And were not those the days when the Church shone forth in spiritual beauty and brightness, the luminary of the world, the theme of admiration and praise to all succeeding generations? But no sooner did she begin to contract the sphere of her efforts in diffusing the light of the Gospel; no sooner did she settle down to enjoy the glorious privileges bestowed by her great Head, forgetful of the multitudes around her famishing for lack of knowledge; no sooner did the evangelistic spirit decline; than she, too, began to decline under the hiding of Jehovah's countenance, and the frown of His displeasure. Look, too, at the condition of the Protestant Church at the close of the Reformation. "It would seem as if the very windows of heaven had been opened, and the showers of grace had descended in an inundation of spiritual gifts and graces, converting the parched lands into pools of water, and the barren wilderness into gardens that bloomed and blossomed as the rose. And now look at the same Church a century afterwards. What a poor, torpid, shrunken, shrivelled thing! As if the heavens were of brass, and the earth of iron, and no dew descending, the very waters of the sanctuary became stagnant, and bred and sent forth a teeming progeny of heresies, schisms, and dissents. Whence the cause of so sad a discomfiture? It was not from the violence of anti-christian adversaries, for never did the Church enjoy a safer respite from the myrmidons of her popish foes. It was not from the fires of political persecution, for never did the Church enjoy a more undisturbed security from the State. No; it was the blight and mildew of Jehovah's displeasure, on account of a neglected and unfaithful stewardship." Instead of extending the triumphs of Protestant Christianity over the realms of paganism, she cast

aside her weapons of aggressive warfare, and settled down in inglorious ease, to enjoy the conquests she had won. And what was the consequence? Her active energy, denied a suitable outlet in aggressive efforts beyond her domain, found ample vent for itself in fomenting intestine discords and divisions within her borders.

Will not our own beloved Presbyterian church lay this lesson to heart? Is it not high time for her to awake out of sinful sleep? Will she continue to be content with just "holding her own?" That she can not do. That she has not done. Failing to advance, she has receded. She has lost ground, and will continue to lose ground, so long as she neglects to use the great arm of her power. Will her slumbers be broken, or will they continue until she is completely shorn of her strength? What, then, is her first duty? Evidently, to call upon her God for help! The evil spirit of unbelief, supineness and indolence, which has possessed her so long, will not be cast out without much fasting, humiliation, and prayer. A call to prayer, then, is the first call which God gives her—to united, fervent, importunate prayer. Is Christ upon His throne? Are His ascension gifts still conferred upon His churches? Has He promised to bestow them when truly desired, and earnestly sought? Is there such an agent in His Church as the almighty Spirit of God? Is He present to animate her with the missionary spirit of her Master? to put her in sympathy with her Great King; to prompt and inspire her petitions for the Redeemer's royal gifts? and then, in His great name, to raise up, qualify, and lead forth to the Church for her acceptance, men called and qualified by Him; men of faith, wisdom, experience, ability, devotion, self-denial, such as Timothy was, "to do the work of an evangelist"? Is it true that the Holy Ghost is with us, to do for us these great things? and that His aid can be obtained by prayer? Do we believe it? Do we expect it? Oh, then, ye that love the Lord, keep not silence; send up a loud, long, united,

unsparing entreaty for His promised aid! "Prove me now, saith the Lord, whether I will not open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing." Shall we not accept the generous challenge? May He open our hearts to expect, and then to receive the promised blessing? Let us never forget that a Pentecost of power was preceded by a Pentecost of prayer. When the disciples were all with one accord in one place, continuing in prayer and supplication, then was the promise of the Father fulfilled, and the powerful influences of the Holy Ghost were poured upon the Church. Were the Presbyteries, during their sessions, in the habit of setting apart a stated season for supplication and prayer, that the Lord Jesus would give to His Church "evangelists," as well as "pastors and teachers," would she not receive them? "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth laborers into His harvest." And were the churches also alive to the importance of this office, so as likewise in their meetings for prayer to put up earnest petitions for the same great gifts, would they not be bestowed; and would not the necessary support be, not grudgingly, but freely, liberally, provided? "According to your faith, so be it unto you," is the plain declaration of the Master.

II. A second great instrumentality, appointed by Christ, but neglected by the Church, is the office of the Ruling Elder—that office, we mean, as it exists in the word of God. According to the Scriptures, ruling elders are representatives, bishops, pastors, and watchers for souls.

1. They are representatives, not deputies. The distinction between these two has long been recognized and admitted. A deputy is one clothed with delegated power, the mere organ, tool, of his constituents, whose instructions he is bound to obey—a substitute, and nothing else. Ruling elders are not such, but officers divinely appointed, and elected by the people to discharge the duties Christ has connected with their office. Christ, not the people, is the

source of their power. And to Christ, not to the people, are they directly responsible. And it is a sad and painful spectacle, to see one invested with this high office recognizing his relations to his Master, not first of all, but last of all, if at all, and weak, timid, wavering, agitated by every breath of popular opinion. They are representatives of Christ—His rights—and the interests of His kingdom. They represent, not the wishes and opinions of the people, but their rights, their duties, their obligations, as these are laid down in the word of God. They are appointed to administer those laws which sustain Christ's authority, and uphold His government over the hearts and lives of His people. To no small extent, are the honor and the glory of the Master intrusted to their keeping. It is a solemn and an awful trust! If that trust is not sacredly guarded, if His rights are compromised, then His judicial visitations need not excite wonder and surprise. For He is God—jealous of His honor and glory. They are to beware, lest they be brought into bondage, either by the favor or the frowns of men. And they need ever to remember that to their own Master they stand or fall.

2. Ruling elders are bishops, the only bishops known to the word of God. "Presbyter" and "bishop" are interchangeable—the former denoting ruling, simply; the latter, the nature of that rule. The apostle Paul thus addresses elders: "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," or bishops. The oversight of the church, then, or its episcopacy, is committed to the elders. They are required to look narrowly into the state of the church, become acquainted with the spiritual condition of its members, counsel, direct, encourage, stimulate, admonish, rebuke, and lead them to a diligent use of all the means for the faithful performance of their solemn covenanted engagements. "Take heed to all the flock"—overlooking none. The very humblest member is to be cared for. The lambs, especially, are to be con-

stantly tended. "The Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." Solemn thought! It is not in the power of man to remove a particle of their responsibility.

3. Ruling elders are pastors. In common usage, this term is exclusively applied to the teaching elder. Such is not the usage of Scripture, which designates the rulers of the Church pastors. It does not belong to the teaching elder, as a teaching elder, but as he, too, is a ruling elder. The term pastor, or shepherd, expresses the general idea of guidance and authority. "Out of thee shall come a governor, that shall be the pastor, or shepherd, of my people Israel." "David, my servant, shall be king over them, and they all shall have one pastor." Elders are enjoined by the apostles Paul and Peter to exercise the pastorate, or shepherd the flock of God; guarding them from enemies, preventing them from wandering, restoring such as have strayed away.

4. Ruling elders are to "watch for souls, as they that must give account." The word "watch," used here, denotes a watchfulness with the greatest care and diligence, and that not without trouble or danger. "They watch for souls!" Words few, but solemn! How important and responsible the office of the ruling elder! It is any thing but a sinecure! They are to watch for souls. It is not a matter of indifference whether their flocks are saved or lost, for "they must give account." This watching implies laboring for their spiritual good with earnestness and self-denying zeal; looking out for opportunities of promoting their spiritual benefit, and then improving these to the utmost.

Ruling elders, then, are, in Scripture, representatives, (not deputies,) bishops, pastors, and watchers for souls. It is deeply to be regretted that these terms have not been uniformly applied to them by us, and that they have been suffered to be exclusively appropriated to the teachers of the church, to whom, as teachers, they do not belong at all.

We have suffered a prelatical mode of thinking, and a prelatical dialect, to intrude into our church, and partially to supplant that which is strictly Presbyterian. To such an extent has this been carried, that no habit is more common amongst us, than to apply to our elders certain terms which actually ignore and deny to them the position of officers in God's house. We call them "laymen," or, worse still, "lay-elders!" A "layman" is a man of the people, and designates a private member in the Church. How apply such a term to an officer? And "lay-elder" is an absurd contradiction in terms. "Lay" implies that he is a private member, and "elder" implies that he is an officer! And yet these ridiculous "nick-names," as Gillespie well characterized them, are constantly applied to officers of God's appointment! It is not a little matter to slight an office that the Holy Ghost hath instituted.

The duties, then, devolving on ruling elders, are the exercising of episcopal and pastoral functions—overseeing and shepherding the flock, and ever watching over precious, immortal souls. It is true that these duties belong also to the minister, because he, too, is an elder, a ruler. But they belong to him in a subordinate degree. They are not his highest duties. The duty of instructing the church is his first duty, his great work, to which, above all things, he must give himself, and to which he must make all things subservient. The duties that are common to the ministers and the elders can not be fully discharged by the former alone. It is impossible. In the vain attempt to monopolize the pastoral care of the flock, he is compelled to neglect the laborious study of the Word, and the requisite preparation for the pulpit. It has been well remarked, by an eminent minister of the Methodist church, Dr. Olin, that "nothing is more idle than the common plea of much preaching, or much pastoral visiting, as an apology for little study, and poor, stale sermons." This

remark is just, and will commend itself to the sober judgment of all. It is an unscriptural sentiment, which has found currency in our day, and is even some times uttered by ministers themselves, that "pastoral visitation is a more important exercise of ministerial duty than preaching the Word." This is either a pretext for the neglect of a most arduous duty, or it is a melancholy delusion. Visiting is, indeed, important; but it is less important and less laborious, in fact is light and easy, compared with that careful preparation necessary to meet the demands of the pulpit. Every student knows that much study is a weariness to the flesh. And the flesh would be more gratified in spending the week in making the tour of the congregation, than in devoting hours and days to exhausting mental toil. It is perfectly idle to quote the example of the apostle Paul, "teaching from house to house." It is perverting this much-abused text to derive from it an obligation on the part of ministers now to pursue a line of conduct similar to that of the apostles. Our circumstances are widely different. The apostolic churches had inspired teachers, who had no need of study, and could, therefore, well devote the whole week to pastoral visitation. But this is not the case with us. Diligent study is absolutely necessary. God's command to ministers is, "Give attendance to reading; meditate upon these things—give thyself wholly to them; if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." "Approved unto God"—not merely to the people. A minister may succeed in pleasing his people, and yet offend his God! God requires that we honor Him with our best offerings, and will not hold us guiltless, when we bring our meanest. "The lame" He forbids us to sacrifice unto the Lord our God.

These considerations serve to show that it is quite impossible for the teaching elder alone to discharge all the duties

of the pastoral office, and meet the whole wants of the church. The coöperation of the other pastors, the ruling elders, is absolutely necessary. Whatever influence the pulpit may exert, how is it possible that it can be secured for the benefit of the hearers, unless it is followed up through the week? How is it possible that the public instructions of the sanctuary can exert a general, abiding, permanent influence upon the congregation, whilst a whole week intervenes, in which little or nothing is done to maintain that influence, and much is constantly occurring to dissipate and destroy it? How much will public appeals, repeated after an interval of six days, effect, if no subsidiary instrumentality is used during that interval? The links are separate from each other, and can not constitute a chain of living, holy, mighty influence to bind together the Church of God, and to cause each member to feel his or her connexion with the whole body, and with Christ, the common Head. What is needed to counteract that insidious influence which is ever setting from the world to the Church is, to employ that very agency which Christ has provided for her welfare and defence; the faithful, united, constant oversight of elders. Have we not suffered sufficiently from the rebukes of the Master for our apathy and shameful neglect of duty? The church should expect of her elders the fulfilment of solemn vows, and the discharge of most important and necessary duties. She has no option, but is shut up to this by the injunction of her Divine Head.

Every church should be furnished with a sufficient number of pastors and bishops, and the congregation should be divided into as many districts as there are pastors, each having his own district, and each watching for souls as one that must give account. Thus every member of the church would be brought under the influence of this continued inspection, and never allowed to forget his union with the

body, or cease to feel its influence.* Thus, that unnatural distance and coldness which has been allowed to find a place amongst Christ's members would be banished. The vital fluid which flows from the heart of Jesus would circulate freely, unimpeded, throughout the entire body, conveying life and health to every member, and creating a sympathy between them all, which would afford a cheering and refreshing proof of the reality of the union; and which, whilst preserving to each its own relative importance, yet will not suffer the eye to say to the hand, "I have no need of thee," nor the head to the feet, "I have no need of you;" but will rather lead them to feel that, though the members be many, yet they are all members of one and the same body; so that if "one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or if one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it;" and thus a practical demonstration be given of the power of a genuine, living Christianity, to unite the various classes of society into one great body; so that, whilst the artificial distinctions that have been created by man are permitted to exist, it is only to show that these are controlled by that higher, nobler unity, which has been created by God—that the tie which binds is stronger than the influence which would repel—and that however diverse in intellectual endowments, in social position, in the gifts of fortune, they may be, they still are, ONE in Christ, their common Head!

Such, then, are the ends contemplated by the office of the elder, the most important, most honorable, most responsible office on earth. To the eye of the world, it is paltry and insignificant. They behold in the offices of Christ's

---

* Another denomination aims to secure this great and all-important end by its class-leader system. Our church has a system designed to accomplish the same end—a system free from those evils which pertain to the other—a system not of man's decree, but of God's appointment—and yet our system is neglected, whilst theirs is worked! They have elders in reality, without the name—we have the name only, without the reality!

appointment, as in Christ Himself, no beauty whatever, that they should be desired. But to the eye of angels and of God, the ruling elder in the Church occupies a position of greater honor, dignity, and influence, than the king upon his throne. The latter has intrusted to him the temporal welfare of his subjects; the former, the spiritual and eternal interests of his flock. The latter is Christ's servant in the state. "By me," says He, "kings reign, by me princes decree justice." The former is Christ's officer in the Church—the Church which sustains the closest relation to Him; purchased with His blood; upheld by His providence against the combined assaults of two worlds; for whose sake kingdoms rise and fall; for whose sake Christ wears many crowns upon His brow, being "Head over all things to the Church!" Surely, to be associated with Christ, the King of kings, in the government of His Church, which controls the destinies of a universe, is the highest honor that can be conferred upon mortal man! "Know you not," says the apostle to the saints, "that we shall judge angels?" If such be the exalted position the office of elder holds in the word of God, the inquiry naturally arises: Why does not this divinely appointed office hold the same exalted position in the eye of the church? Why this most unnatural and painful contrast between the elders of the Scriptures and the elders of the churches?—the great majority of them, we mean, for there are some noble exceptions, to whom all honor is due. Who is to be blamed for this sad declension, this marring the integrity and efficiency of our noble system, this mournful apathy, this death-like stupor, which, to an alarming extent, possesses our entire Presbyterian church, and stifles its energies? The answer which truth unhesitatingly gives, is: All are to be blamed—ministers, elders, and people, are all guilty before God.

1. Ministers are guilty, in not declaring the whole counsel of God upon this important subject, in not presenting before the Church a full exhibition of the teachings of Scrip-

ture with respect to this office. Some are even reluctant to admit the identity of the office of elder with their own, his parity with themselves, and degrade him to a subordinate and inferior rank; whether from prejudice, ambition, jealousy, or, as Ambrose, in the fourth century, thought, from pride; "they alone," says he, "wishing to appear something."

2. Elders themselves are guilty, in not fully recognizing and assuming the responsibilities which the Holy Ghost has devolved upon them. Some doubt whether these high responsibilities are, indeed, theirs, and say that they had no thought of assuming such when they accepted the office. The question is, not what their intentions were, but what do the Scriptures teach? "Whatever is not of faith, is sin." "He that doubteth is condemned," are solemn words, which they would do well to ponder. It is a matter of too great consequence to allow any doubting. They are bound to search the Scriptures, and see whether these things be so, and if convinced that they are, then, either in the fear of God and by the help of His grace, address themselves diligently to their work; or, if unwilling to discharge the legitimate duties of the office, to vacate the office itself; for woe to that man who persists in retaining an office in the church to which God never called him! It is a dangerous thing to trifle with the institutions of the Holy Ghost. It may be said that this doctrine would empty the church of its elders. If it did, it would only empty it of those who have no right to be elders; the loss of whom would be to the church great gain. For just as there may be ministers whom God never called to preach the Gospel, so also may there be elders whom God never called to rule. That this doctrine would remove from the eldership a single individual who had a right to be in it, is quite impossible. The providing the Church with faithful officers, is not the work of man, but the work of Him on whom the Church depends; her ever-living, glorious Head. Elders, truly called,

are among the ascension-gifts of Christ, and are kept in office just as long as it pleases their divine Master to keep them. To say that the promulgation of a doctrine founded on Scripture has a tendency to eject from an office, appointed by Christ, the men whom Christ called to it, is a horrible absurdity.

Again: Some elders there are, who do not doubt, but deny, that their office involves any such responsibilities as we have indicated. These are bound to maintain their position out of the Scriptures—which they never will do. As the doctrine of this paper is the doctrine of our Synod,* it becomes those who take this ground to vacate their office. If they do not, they should be required to discharge its duties. If they decline, they should be admonished; and if they still refuse, they should be deposed. And so should all who will not perform the duties of bishops and pastors, and watchers for souls.

Again: Some there are, who assume it to be their vocation to take oversight of the minister, instead of the flock, and are as willing to discharge the duty of the presbytery, in this respect, as they are to neglect their own. Narrow-minded, conceited, arrogant, and overbearing, they aspire to lord it over God's heritage, vainly imagining themselves to be the "main pillars" of their churches, whilst justly regarded by the spiritually-minded portion of the members as the main obstacles to its welfare. This class, we are happy to believe, is comparatively small.

But, to specify no others, how few of the large body of elders in our churches have any just ideas of the character and duties of their office! How many look upon it as a mere

---

* The proof of this will appear by referring to the carefully prepared "Report on the State of the Church," made to the Synod in Lewisburg, Sept. 4, 1857, and to the accompanying resolutions, adopted by the Synod; also, by referring to the excellent discourse of Dr. Ramsey, on the office of Ruling Elder, the re-publication of which, and distribution in every congregation, was recommended by the Synod.

human appointment, whose duties they may discharge only as inclination prompts or leisure permits! How general is the notion, that by serving the communion-table, by attending upon the meetings of session, and occasionally on other ecclesiastical bodies, they have exhausted the duties of their office! Whereas the first-named service, the distribution of the sacramental elements, so far from being their characteristic duty, is not their duty at all—it forming a part of that table-service which Christ has assigned to the deacons, and which was performed by them in the primitive church and subsequently, as is abundantly shown by the testimonies of Justin Martyr, who lived within fifty years of the apostle John; the learned Bingham; Dr. Owen, who, congregationalist though he was, recognized the distinction between ruling elders and deacons; Dr. Guyse; John Brown of Haddington, who has been well characterized as "one of the most decisive, consistent, and devoted Presbyterians that ever lived;" Rutheford; the Church of Scotland, as shown by the "Collections of Steuart of Pardovan;" and by the testimony of many others. And yet this is the service which is more commonly associated with the eldership, in the minds of most, than any other! How large a number are found treating as a sinecure the highest office on earth, to which they have been called, if called at all, by the Holy Ghost! How few are jealous of the sacred rights which Christ has given them! A neglect of the duties of an office naturally leads to a surrender of the rights pertaining to it. A return to duties will be followed by an acknowledgment of rights. For it is idle for any to dream that their rights will be respected whilst their duties are trampled under foot. A return to duties will do more than aught beside to recommend the symmetry, the beauty, and the power of the Presbyterianism of the Scriptures! Now, let us grant that, to constitute an efficient, active, zealous, devoted elder, much effort, self-denial, and sacrifice are necessary; what

then? Shall we shrink back on this account? Is any thing really valuable ever accomplished without sacrifice? Was not our salvation effected by sacrifice? Was not Christ, altogether, soul and body, a sacrifice for us? Is not heaven ours by sacrifice? And does not Christ promise to the faithful elder "a crown of glory that fadeth not away;" a richer crown in the kingdom above than will be allotted to the private Christian, whose duties and responsibilities are not so great, and whose sacrifices are less? And whatever sacrifice of feeling may be involved, should it not be made the more readily, when it is remembered that the cross feels heavy only because they have not been accustomed to bear it, only because of a long-continued neglect of most important duties? And if their inexperience renders them reluctant to act as spiritual overseers, yet habitual and intimate intercourse with their people will soon reconcile them to their employment, and ultimately convert into enjoyment what at first was felt to be a trial. The inquiry of the sincere Christian with regard to any point of duty is, not whether the performance of it is difficult, dangerous, or even seemingly impossible, but simply, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" "The practicability of a duty is felt to be properly judged of, not by the appearance it presents to our judgment, but by the command of our Lord. If He has commanded, we go forward, fearing nothing that may seem to lie in our way. The greater the task, the more real is the testimony and expression of love, and therefore the more acceptable to God. If the Israelites had, through fear, declined to obey God's command to go down into the Red Sea, the Church of God in that day would have been extinct."

3. The people, also, share, to no little extent, this guilt with ministers and elders. They do not look upon this office in its true scriptural light. Elders are among the ascension-gifts of Christ. "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And

He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for a work of service, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Here we are distinctly taught that pastors, or elders, are Christ's ascension-gifts to the Church, which she can not dispense with. To undervalue them, then, is to insult the Lord Jesus Christ, now upon His throne, by undervaluing His precious gifts to His Church. As gifts, they must be sought, and earnestly sought, from Christ. The appeal here is made, as every where else, to the faith of the church. The church must look upon these officers with the eye of faith, as gifts from Christ. The eye of faith only can see the divine appointment, and the obligations growing out thereof, and the excellence, beauty, and glory of the office. If not viewed by faith, if not sought by faith, if not received by faith, what right has the church to expect a blessing with them? "Whatever is not of faith is sin." Here we touch the root of the evil in the church. The office is looked upon with the natural eye, not with the spiritual. Hence, the same associations, the same views and feelings are generally connected with this, as with any other office. Many, very many, feel as little reverence when engaged in the election of a ruling elder, as in the election of an alderman. And yet, the election of a ruling elder is a solemn act of worship on the part of the church! The office is a divine appointment; the officer is a divine gift; for Christ not only founded the pastorate, but He gives the pastors. "He gave some, pastors." The men, then, are His gifts. When, therefore, the church assembles for the election of elders, for what does she assemble, but to receive Christ's gifts from Christ's hands? And how much solemn deliberation, investigation, patient reflection, above all, how much earnest prayer for divine guidance, is necessary, that the people of God may not err in their choice! If the appointed means have been faithfully used; if the qualifications for the office have been closely marked, as

these are laid down in the Scriptures; and if, with singleness of eye to the divine glory, they have, after earnest prayer, been led to cast their votes for those whom they judge to possess them; then, just as surely as Christ has promised His presence with His Church, just so surely are they warranted to believe that His Spirit and providence have led them to choose those whom He has chosen and set apart for this exalted office; an additional evidence of which is supplied by the conviction of duty which He fastens upon the minds of those thus chosen, so that they dare not disobey the divine call. Now, are the churches wont to exercise such care, such watchfulness, such an inspection into their own hearts, lest they be influenced by carnal motives; sending up to the throne earnest petitions for the guidance of the Spirit; pleading for Christ's gifts; acting as in the immediate presence of Christ Himself; and approaching a divine ordinance with so much reverence, that their act may justly be styled an act of worship; and then receiving from Christ's hands His own gifts, with some thing of that reverential affection with which He Himself receives them from the Father? When the Saviour was on earth, how did He act when about to engage in that most important work of choosing and setting apart His apostles? He spent the whole preceding night in fervent prayer to God! And then, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, whose influences were given to Him without measure, He chose the men who subsequently proved to be such distinguished ornaments and priceless blessings to the Church. And what were these men? As to their extraordinary office, they were apostles. But as to their ordinary office, they were elders. Peter, addressing elders, styles himself "also an elder." Now, did the great Head of the Church Himself, pure and holy though He was, deem it meet to prepare Himself for so important a work as the selection of the men who should control the destinies of His Church, by a whole night spent in fervent prayer; and yet, shall the

Church, without due preparation, carelessly, irreverently, approach the same solemn work? Oh! is there no profaneness in this monstrous indifference? Is she not signally rebuked by the example of her Divine Head? And will He not signally rebuke her, by a judicial visitation, for this her sin? As she dishonors Him, will He not also dishonor her, and permit unworthy, incompetent, unfaithful men to intrude into a sacred office, that they may be obstacles and stumbling-blocks, and prove thus to be the rod with which He chastens her for her unbelief, her irreverence, and her carnality? And as such officers were not the offspring of faith, but were chosen from carnal motives, mere natural preference or relationship—chosen because of their social position, their wealth, influence, prominence, with a view to render their church thereby more respectable, more influential, elevate its social status in the eyes of the community—what is to be expected but a low standard of piety in those churches? And such officers can not fail to react upon the churches disastrously to their spirituality, and reduce their standard of piety lower still. Knowing well the motives which swayed the people in their election, they will be more careful to maintain their standing and promote their popularity, than to promote the true interests of the churches, by resolutely opposing any evil practices which obtain in them. They will be much more apt to wink at sin than to censure it. And as for enforcing discipline against offenders of influence and power, that is a duty which no one need expect them to perform. The stream can not rise above its source. Men chosen from carnal motives, to an exalted office, which demands no little degree of spirituality on the part of those who fill it, can not fail to carnalize the church still more. The offence of the cross entirely ceases. Instead of a cross-bearing, Christ-following church, that has power with God and man, we have a "highly respectable," "influential," "fashionable," "aristocratic," church, after the Laodicean model, that God

abhors, and the world despises. This is no fancy picture, but a stern and humbling reality. Faithful ministers, faithful elders, faithful members, have again and again complained of this sad state of things; have again and again gone to the Master, and laid their burdens before Him. Is not Christ jealous of His honor? Will not a day of reckoning come—a day of fearful visitation? And who may abide the day of His coming, when a retributive providence will avenge the dishonor cast upon His name, and the insults offered to His Spirit; when the various idols which men have set up and worshipped shall be dashed in pieces; and a fearful sifting and overturning vindicate Christ's authority over His own house, and prove Him to be "a consuming fire" to a carnal, worldly-minded, corrupted church!

But again: The fact must not be overlooked that the insensibility of many church-members to the importance and value of the eldership, arises from their indifference to the whole subject of church government. How often is the remark made, "I feel but little interest in the subject of church government." But how strange does such a sentiment sound, coming from a member of the church! What! A Christian taking no interest in what Christ has instituted! A Christian regarding one of the most valuable features of Christ's kingdom a matter of little consequence! A Christian treating a divine institution as a mere human expedient for the preservation of order! Every element of Christ's kingdom—its government and worship, as well as its doctrines—in short, every thing contained in Christianity, addresses itself to the faith of Christ's people. And if any thing relating to Christ's kingdom does not interest a Christian, it is owing to a defective faith. But faith is not a blind, but an enlightened principle, and how can it be called into exercise, where sufficient knowledge does not previously exist? It is a great mistake to suppose that a particular form of church government is a matter of little

consequence. Christ has not only instituted government, but its form. The relation between a form of church government and its doctrine and worship, is direct, close, and intimate. It is the shell which guards the kernel. It is the body which covers and preserves the soul. Every student of ecclesiastical history is forced to see this. Why is it that certain forms of government, and certain systems of doctrine, and certain modes of worship, are found uniformly associated together? Why are Presbyterianism and Calvinism in such close sympathy and union? Many of the churches of New England were once Presbyterian as to church government, and Calvinistic as to doctrine. When the Presbyterianism was gradually supplanted by Congregationalism, how did it happen that the Calvinism was not retained, but in like manner was supplanted by Socinianism? This same result uniformly obtains. But how can it be explained, if a particular form of government be a matter of indifference, and have, as many suppose, no influence upon the doctrines and worship of a church? It has been well remarked by the Rev. Mr. Thompson, a minister of Scotland, that "the grinding persecution to which the Presbyterians of England were subjected by Cromwell, an Independent, and by the Episcopalians, under the Stuarts, prevented them from erecting the platform of their scriptural polity, and familiarized many to the more attainable, plastic, and accommodating institutions of Congregationalism. Presbyterians began to look upon forms of church government as not of divine institution; they regarded them as merely human expedients for the preservation of order; that, therefore, a church might be just as scripturally constituted under one form as another. They talked, indeed, of Episcopacy being adapted to rich and gorgeous England, and of Presbyterianism being adapted to poor and homely Scotland. The necessary consequence of this miserable delusion was, that the strictness of discipline gave way; Presbyterianism came to be branded as stiff, rigid, puritan-

ical, and unaccommodating; and numbers of the churches lapsed into Independency, and thence sank into Socinianism. Seldom were pains taken to instruct the people in the counsel of God respecting the form and government of the church. Every thing relating to such matters was rather, indeed, studiously kept out of view. The result was inevitable; the people became ignorant of the subject, and as indifferent to it as they were ignorant of it. The consequence was, that the frame-work of Presbyterianism was, in many places, gradually and utterly dissolved; and congregation after congregation passed into other communions, without even an effort being made to retain them!" The description that this writer gives of the sad decline of Presbyterianism in England, applies with equal justice to many other countries. In Scotland, during the time that the General and Provincial Assemblies were suppressed, and the Presbyteries neglected, ministers became negligent, immorality and heresy prevailed, and popery increased. In Germany, where infidel tenets were substituted for the pure word of God, this lamentable condition is traceable to the deficient constitution of the German churches, and their entire want of control over the opinions of their own ministers. In Geneva itself, where a pure Calvinism has, to a great extent, been supplanted by the Socinian heresy, this was owing to the worldly character of the elders, and their exclusion from the highest ecclesiastical court, which is composed of ministers only. By these means, unprincipled men were enabled gradually and insidiously to supplant with Socinian formularies all the existing standards of the church. These instances show that there is not a more unfounded notion than that a particular form of church government is a matter of indifference. Let us cleave to our simple, pure, consistent, scriptural Presbyterianism! Let the flock of Christ give to their rulers that honor which is their due; let them place a high estimate upon their office, for its dignity, importance, and value.

Let them expect much from their elders, and encourage them in going forward to carry out the true idea of their office, remembering that they watch for souls as they that must give account; and remembering, too, that they themselves are responsible to Christ for any obstacles they place in the way of His officers to the faithful discharge of their duty. "Offences," or stumbling-blocks, said our Lord, "must needs come, but woe to that man by whom they come!" There is reason to fear that, in this matter, also, offences will come, that the faithful elder will encounter these stumbling-blocks. But if he is counted worthy to suffer with Christ, he shall also be permitted to reign with Christ. There is reason to fear that many who, by their profession, are numbered amongst the disciples of Christ, and the subjects of His kingdom, are yet opposed to the administration of His laws. Such persons would be sure to regard it as out of character, nay, even officious, in elders visiting from house to house, in their official capacity, for the purpose of religious conversation and prayer. Whilst the truly pious membership would rejoice to see the day when the elders of the church should again appear in their ancient, honored character of bishops and pastors of Christ's flock; yet, it is equally certain that the worldly-minded portion would dislike any such spiritual oversight; and although their constituted guardians go amongst the flock, not for the purpose of prying into the secrets of families, or of being busy-bodies in other men's matters, but simply to watch over them in the Lord, and stir them up to love and good works, yet would they esteem such oversight as this an intrusion, an encroachment upon their lawless liberty—their liberty to disgrace their profession and crucify their Master! The yoke of Christ is to them an intolerable burden, and they do not wish this man to reign over them. Such persons are in the church, but not of the church. They belong to the world, are the friends of the

world, the partisans of the world; and are in the church, as spies in the camp of an enemy, only to betray it.

These, then, are the causes of our shameful delinquency as a church. We have a noble system, not of man's device, but of God's appointment, but we have failed to work it fully as we ought. The evil influences which withstand the operation of our ecclesiastical machinery must be overcome, or we shall continue to languish and droop under the rebukes of the Master. To contemplate the vast resources with which Christ has endowed our Presbyterian Zion, and then contrast with these her actual achievements, is enough to sicken the heart. The statistics of the Virginia church, in former years, setting forth the additions made to the churches, have been carefully collected, and submitted to this Synod. We have examined those of later years, and find that, upon the whole, we have made little, if any progress. The facts are briefly these: In one year an average of one member to each minister; in another year, two members to each minister; in another year, four members to each minister; in another year, five members to each minister; in another year, three members to each minister.

And is this all that has been accomplished? Can we be content with such humiliating results? It is true, that by resorting to unscriptural measures, as others do, we could fill our churches with converts; but converts of man's making constitute poor materials for a church of God. The question is not, what have we done compared with other churches, but what have we done compared with what, having the ample furniture that God has given us, we should have done? The facts adduced show our shortcomings to be painfully great. We have need, as a church, to humble ourselves in the dust before God, confess with shame our sins, and address ourselves anew to the work He has assigned us. We greatly need a fresh baptism of the Holy Ghost. Why are His influences withheld? The answer is, we have refused to honor Him, and He has

refused to honor us. The instrumentalities He has appointed to accomplish the results we desire, we have neglected to employ. We are not using the means of His appointment. If He has provided the Church with the officers she requires for her nurture and growth; if He has appointed some to the high and responsible office of overseers, or bishops of souls, shepherds, or pastors of His flock; and we are slighting this office and thus slighting Him, esteeming it of little value, not acting faith in God, and expecting much from the discharge of its duties, and so not employing the appointed instrumentalities, what need we wonder that our condition should be just what it is, unfruitful, cold, and almost dead? The common opinion is, that if additions are not made to the churches, the ministry must be in fault. Is this necessarily so? Who gave the church the right to hold such an opinion? Who gave any elder the right to hold such an opinion? The Scriptures? No! They teach that, though Paul were the minister, yet if Christ's institutions were not observed, His Church would wither and die. A church may try to escape from her obligations, but the day of reckoning will come for her. An elder whose conscience is seared may seek to elude his responsibilities, transfer them all to the minister, and complacently attribute to him the languishing, declining condition of the church; but the hour will come when an aroused conscience will make him writhe under her scorpion lash, as the words of the Master fill his soul with confusion, fear, and horror: "Thou wicked and slothful servant!"

It is idle for the church to wonder at her want of success, when the well-known means instituted to secure it are ignored and neglected. When they are used, and in faith, God's wisdom and faithfulness are pledged to crown them with success, and bestow the needed blessings. But the inquiry arises, how can elders discharge such duties consistently with their secular engagements?

As example is better than precept, we invite attention to the following notice of one who well illustrated the power of the eldership, and the strength it gives to the church:

"The late Patrick Falconer, Esq., was first called to the eldership in the Tron Parish, under the pastoral charge of Dr. Chalmers, and subsequently in St. John's. Of all the active, laborious, faithful men with whom Dr. C. was surrounded and supported, this gentleman was in labors the most abundant, and in perseverance the most unwearied, and with one accord the session of St. John's concede to their departed brother the preëminence in this work and labor of love. For the last seventeen years of his life, he gave all his leisure, and for the last ten, the whole of his time to the duties of his office. Whilst many retired—and fortunate merchants think they have no account to render of their time to God—this good man increased in well-doing, as he increased in years; whilst some grew weary of their labor of love, he grew more devoted; and whilst others doffed their spiritual office, and shrunk into mere men of the world, he became more single-hearted as he advanced in life, and lived more exclusively for the glory of the Master whom he served. Every day, when in health, was he to be seen wending his way from his residence in the west end of the city, to the farthest extremity of the east, where his poor district lay; and punctual to his hour, the shop-keepers inquired if all was well, when they missed his familiar face. Twice or thrice every year, he regularly visited each of the eighty-three families in his district, besides his visitation of the sick; and we are assured that he was three hundred days, out of the three hundred and sixty-five, in his district. No London magistrate ever acquainted himself more laboriously with the work-districts of the metropolis, in order to detect and punish, than this gentleman did in his district, in order to prevent crime, and reform the criminal. On the practi-

cal experience of this laborious office-bearer in the church, all good men will set a just value. That experience we shall give in his own words. 'Perhaps there is a general feeling,' says he, 'that a man needs to be disengaged from business, in some considerable degree at least, before he can efficiently undertake the office of elder. My experience leads me to think that a man who can spare an hour a day, or even two hours a week, may do as much good in that little time as one who has the whole of his time at his disposal. Besides, in the evangelizing of the world, it is evident the great power must come from the little of each agent, accumulated into the aggregate of the many. Each and every man doing the little he can, is the source whence the irresistible force at length is to come, which, in Christ, is to overcome the deadness, darkness, and depravity which now pervade the earth. I can not, while on this point, forbear to notice the importance of doing all to the glory of God, and to be seen of Him, and of coming, not only to the feeling of this, as our motive for doing, but also as our excitement to do whatever we have within the compass of our power. Such a feeling as this will not permit us to withhold what we can do, because it is little. Under any other feeling, no individual will do any thing, except it can be distinctly seen as a great thing; and this is the cause that vast power, which might be collected from the many, is lost. Proper division of labor is also vastly important. Various things, such as distributing tracts, or missionary intelligence, or reading to those who can not read for themselves, may be easily done by such as have no gift for exhortation or prayer. The exact plan which I think best for a spiritual elder to adopt, and which I am decidedly of opinion is requisite to an efficient religious superintendence is, that, together with the particular calls upon the sick, etc., he keep a regular progressive visit of the whole going on; so that he may visit every family once, twice, or as often as may be, within the year. I think it

very important that he do not allow himself to act as a judge or a divider, nor even very much as an adviser in worldly matters. Every elder should study to fill his mouth with arguments, in order to turn parental affection to the eternal interests of children, instead of allowing it to be absorbed entirely by their temporal concerns. Seek first, says Christ, the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. We should keep eternity constantly in view, and act under the felt impression of the unseen world. Every spiritually-minded elder will endeavor to press these things upon the people of his charge; he will be earnest to stir up parents to their religious duties.' "

May these weighty words of Mr. Falconer sink deep into the hearts of all elders! With such an example before us of the power, efficiency, and usefulness of the office of the eldership, and of the practicability, in any ordinary circumstances of business, of the duties it requires, are we not called upon, as we regard the purity, the peace, the stability, the increase of our church, to restore this office where it is wanting, and to perfect it where it already exists? We have here the testimony of a man of great experience, as well as great wisdom and piety. That testimony is entitled to be received. Consider what he says: "An elder who spares only two hours a week, may do as much good in that little time as one who has the whole of his time at his disposal." Now, whose secular engagements are so absorbing as not to afford him two hours in seven days to the duties of this office? If any plead that they can not spare even this, then it is evident that the business of this world occupies more of their time than it should, and that the sooner they vacate an office of such tremendous responsibilities, the better.

We find, in the autobiography of that judicious man, Dr. James W. Alexander, the following brief notice of a faithful elder: "Our theory of a church-session," says he, "is grand;

but O what a practice! It is made for a church in a high spiritual state; and this, I think, is in its favor. One of my elders makes up to every man, woman, and child, who frequents the church. He visits as much as I do; knows every church-member; talks to every inquirer; goes often to every house, and when I point out any place, is sure to be there within twenty-four hours. This leads me to two practical reflections: 1. How important to have a number of young men in training for such offices. 2. How desirable for a pastor so to labor as to leave the church in the best possible state for his successor; in regard particularly to the children, youth, family habits, etc."

Are there not such men also in our own Synod? There are: would that there were more! Such shall never lose their reward. Their names are honored on earth; their names are honored in heaven. The gratitude of the church is due to those who open, and widen, and deepen the channels for those streams of living water which gladden the city of God. Angels contemplate their radiant career with admiration and rejoicing; and Jesus, from His illustrious throne, looks down upon them with delight; and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, He will confer upon them a crown of life!

As we pen these lines, we naturally call to mind a noble example of a faithful, untiring, consistent, and devoted elder, who realized the responsibilities of his high calling, and was enabled by grace to fulfil them. He has passed from the service of the Master on earth, to the rich rewards of the Master in heaven. A distinguished blessing to the church which he so faithfully served, the memory of his elevated Christian character, his holy life, the rich unction of his prayers and exhortations, is devoutly cherished; and consecrated for ever in the affections of a grateful people is the honored name of JOHN B. MARTIN.*

---

* Ruling elder in Second Presbyterian Church, Richmond.

We conclude our remarks upon this subject by expressing the wish that the time-honored, God-honored custom of presbyterial visitations, which obtained in the palmiest days of the church in Scotland, may be restored amongst us. Let the presbyteries return to their duty. Let them visit, by committees, all the churches under their care, institute a close investigation into the spiritual condition of each, making minute inquiries as to the manner in which the minister, the elders, the deacons, and the people, discharge their respective duties. Will it be said that this practice requires too much time and trouble? Our honored fathers thought not thus of it, if thereby they could advance the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, and promote the glory of the Redeemer's name. And shall we shrink from the sacrifices which they cheerfully and joyfully made? Then are we the degenerate children of a noble ancestry! If this custom should not be at once revived, let us endeavor at least to approximate to it as much as possible. Let the presbyteries require of sessions a written statement, to be presented at each spring meeting, of the number of pastoral visits which each minister and each elder makes during the year, and of the manner in which each discharges his duty. If, in the judgment of presbytery, the number of visits be not sufficient, let such persons be urged to greater diligence, and a record be made of this. Let such as are negligent be faithfully admonished by the presbyteries. And if any continue in the persistent violation of their solemn obligations, after admonition given again and again, then let all such delinquents be deposed, as a duty the presbytery owes to Christ, and to His Church. Let the Synod enjoin upon the presbyteries to require this report from the sessions. This will make elders, as well as ministers, amenable to presbytery, which they are not now, but are virtually independent; for the amenability of elders to the session is just the amenability of elders to themselves! This is a regulation which is consistently

Presbyterian, and which is absolutely necessary not only for promoting the growth of our church, but maintaining its vitality. Such an investigation may extend the meetings of presbyteries; but the approbation of the Master, and the benefit accruing to the churches, will abundantly compensate them for all the time and labor they expend in this noble work.

III. Another instrumentality appointed by Christ for the well-being of His Church, but too much neglected by her, is the Deaconship. Our limits forbid us giving that extended notice which is due to it.

Many persons, without sufficient examination, entertain the opinion that this office was, for the first time, introduced into the Church of God on the occasion recorded in the sixth chapter of Acts. This is to overlook the fact, which has been abundantly proved by learned Jewish and Christian writers, Maimonides, Vitringa,* Lightfoot, Hammond, Neander, Mosheim, Burnet, Olshausen, and others, that the office of deacon existed in the church long before the days of Christ and His apostles. In the Jewish church—in the synagogue—there were not only elders, but deacons. "The office of the deacon," says the learned Lightfoot, "was translated from the Jewish to the Christian church. There were in every synagogue at least three deacons, to whom the care of the poor was intrusted." "The synagogue-deacons," says another learned scholar, "collected money for the maintenance of the poor, and for the general support of the synagogue, including the stipends of the office-bearers." Many learned Jewish theologians affirm that this office belonged to the synagogue. Here, then, we have clear proof that the Christian church is modelled after the Jewish synagogue, not only with reference to the eldership,

* "*Totum Regimen* Ecclesiarum Christi conformatum fuit *ad synagogarum exemplar.*" "Res adeo est clara, ut de Diaconis synagogæ nullus fere possit cogitare, cujus mens continuo non deflectatur ad Diaconos Ecclesiæ." De Synagogâ Vetere.

but to the deaconship also; and that, in the language of Archbishop Whateley, "wherever a Jewish synagogue existed, that was brought to embrace the Gospel, the apostles did not there so much form a Christian church or congregation, as make an existing congregation Christian, by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, but leaving the machinery of government unchanged, the officers being already provided in the existing institutions." "A synagogue became a Christian church as soon as its members acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah." Thus, the Old Testament Church naturally glided into the New Testament Church. The deacons of the converted synagogue became the deacons of the Christian church. This is the reason why no record exists of the original institution of this office by the apostles. For the narrative contained in the sixth chapter of Acts implies that the seven chosen and ordained on that occasion were added to the number already existing. The office is not mentioned in that narrative: only the duties of the office are incidentally alluded to, which would imply that the office was already in existence. Those elected on that occasion were the first Grecian deacons. There were Hebrew deacons before this—deacons in every converted synagogue. Besides, the New Testament Church must have had some dispensers of its bounty before this, and therefore, either the apostles officiated as deacons, or else this officer already existed, and discharged his duty. But that the apostles did not officiate as deacons, is evident from their own words: "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables;"—shewing that they had not left the word of God and served tables. And, therefore, this service was discharged by the deacons themselves. The seven who were elected afterwards, were all Grecians, as their names shew, because the Grecians (or foreign Jews) had murmured against the Hebrews, (or native Jews,) on account of their widows being neglected in the daily ministration. Now, this surely would have produced in turn

a murmuring of the Hebrews against the Grecians, unless they had some already in office interested in looking after their rights.*

This office is not a temporary institution, but is to abide in the Church throughout all generations: 1. A necessity will always exist for this office. Ministers and elders can not attend to their own duties, and to this also. 2. The work itself, as a distinct work of service, is never to cease. 3. Deacons are reckoned, in Scripture, amongst the fixed officers of the Church. 4. Direction is given for their continuance in all the churches, and their qualifications are mentioned. It follows, then, that to give up this office in a church, where there are members who possess the required qualifications, or to give its duties to another, is to take the work of the Holy Ghost out of His own hands, and to interfere with the order Christ has instituted in His Church. The remarks of John Brown of Haddington deserve to be well pondered: "There is no hint in Scripture that the offices of ruling elder and deacon were designed to be temporary. Both of them were appointed on moral grounds and necessities, respecting every church and period. The rules concerning them both are to be observed till the end of the world. No congregation, therefore, can answer to Jesus Christ for dropping of deacon, any more than for dropping of elder."

The principal business of deacons is to serve tables. The old distinction, current for ages past, to the present time, refers the term "tables" to three separate departments: the table of the Lord, the table of the pastor, the table of the poor. The whole fiscal concerns of churches should be committed to them, and it would be well if, in every church, a bench of deacons were incorporated by law, that they might be enabled to hold and employ all the property of the church. Let those who are known to the church as

* See Encyclopædia Metropolitana; Article, Ecclesiastical History.

deacons, be known to the state as trustees. It is far better in keeping with the character of a church, that its fiscal concerns should be intrusted to Christ's own officers, a bench of deacons, than to a board of trustees, who are not known to Scripture, and who are often chosen without regard to piety.*

It was also the business of the deacons, in the primitive church, says Bingham, in his "Christian Antiquities," to be "the regulators and directors of men's behavior in divine service. They had power to rebuke the irregular, to overlook and superintend the people, that no one did talk, or sleep, or laugh, but give ear to the word of God." It belongs to them, also, to receive the stranger who may visit the sanctuary with a kind welcome, and provide him with a suitable seat. In the whole routine of duty, in every service, even the least important, they are to remember that what they do, they do unto the Lord. And the dignity of His great name is lent to the smallest service they discharge. The deacon represents a most important part of solemn worship. For alms-giving is an office of Christian worship; and collecting for the poor and the spread of the Gospel, is an ordinance of God. The very existence of such an officer in the church is strikingly significant, and represents most important and valuable features in the character of the Church of God. Just as the appointment of the teaching elder represents the Church as a school, where saving truth is taught, and instruction imparted; just as the appointment of the ruling elder represents the Church as a government, a republic, so does the office of deacon represent the missionary character of the Church, as it dispenses the collections for the spread of the Gospel. Again, it

* A worthy minister of the Synod of Virginia, formerly the pastor of a church in Philadelphia, informed the writer that, during his ministry in that church, the president of the board of trustees was a rich Jew, who often complained of the trouble he had in keeping the session in order.

represents the Church as a charitable institution, in providing for the poor. And it represents, too, the fellowship of Christians in each other's gifts, showing that they are united to the same Head, and are members of the same body.

The appointment of the deacon in the Church is a signal token of God's care of the poor. The poor will always be in the world, and will always be in the church, and ought to be in every church. Christ has made them peculiarly His representatives on earth, and by ministering to them the church is ministering to Him. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me." The presence of the poor in the church is absolutely necessary for its prosperity, as they furnish the occasion for counteracting the greatest evil of our fallen nature, selfishness, and for developing the brightest graces of the Christian character. The deacons should enter into the spirit of their high calling, and seek, as the organ of the church, to minister to Christ, by ministering to His poor members, and to promote the interests of Christ's kingdom, not only by visiting the poor of their own flock, but the poor who belong to no flock, who are destitute of the means of grace, either willingly or unwillingly. It was the custom in Scotland for deacons to divide the suburbs of the towns and cities, where the poor generally dwelt, into so many different wards, each deacon having in his ward a given number of families, which he was expected to visit regularly for the purpose of religious conversation and prayer, as well as of contributing to supply their temporal wants. Hear the testimony of one of these working, faithful deacons: "With fifty-six families, in ordinary circumstances, very little of my time was occupied, and my office was by no means irksome; but when the families increased to eighty, one hundred, and upwards, I found it more difficult to keep up my acquaintance in the district, so that I had less comfort in going amongst them; and whilst my visits were in

reality more requisite, they became less frequent. It is easy to keep up a pleasant, familiar knowledge of a small number of families, which creates such interest as to carry one readily back to the district. My first aim was to become acquainted with all the families; and when any person applied for relief, I visited, and made a strict investigation, and then gave in a report of the case at our first monthly meeting. If the applicant was out of work, or had children able for work, we used such means as were within our reach to get employment for them. With few exceptions, I was well received; and in many cases most cordially welcomed, and much pressed to repeat my visit soon. The mainspring of my management consisted in kindness; prompt attention to every application, whether deserving or not; never administering help in ignorance, to save myself the trouble of a visit, rigid investigation, etc."

It is obvious at once what a prodigious influence for good the revival of this system of visitation on the part of the deacon would exert upon the poor, upon the church, upon society. A hallowed bond of union would thus be established between the various classes of society, differences would be softened, and jealousies and alienations, in great measure, checked. The Church would, through her organs, discharge the blessed office of the peace-maker in the world, binding the various classes together by sacred bonds, and causing them to feel a becoming interest in each other, and to realize that though the members were different, the body was one. The deacon thus represents the conservative influence of the Church upon society. How would the poor, too, be benefited by the working of such a noble system! How many vices would disappear, how many virtues would take their place, how would poverty itself, in many instances, be prevented or cured! With such a kind care exercised over the poor, looking mainly to their religious improvement, the exhortations and prayers of the faithful deacon, the Bibles, tracts, and re-

ligious newspapers with which he furnishes them, could not fail of elevating and blessing them for this world and the next. For the divine favor would crown this system with signal success. And how would the church herself be benefited? The blessing of the poor man, which is of no small price, would be her's; and, more than that, the approbation of her exalted Head. Seeking to do good in the way of His appointment, His special smile would rest upon her labors. What multitudes of poor would be added to her congregations, and ultimately to her communion! The present habitual non-attendance of thousands at any place of worship, is an alarming evil. Here is the divine remedy for correcting it. May we have grace given us to use it! Then will it be true of us, as it was of the church in apostolic days, that the appointment of faithful deacons was followed by this glorious result—"the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples was multiplied."

But the spirit that animated the primitive church must possess the church still, or the mere appointment of the deacon will be of no avail. That spirit was one of eminent liberality, the hearty consecration of the substance to Christ's cause. How poor are the offerings of the New Testament Church, compared with her high distinctions, her exalted privileges, her priceless blessings! Nay, how poor are the offerings of the New Testament Church compared with the offerings of the Old Testament Church. The great law of the tithe was then universally observed, but now how few there are who honor it! It is urged by some that this law, being a part of the Mosaic economy, ceased with it, and does no longer bind. Even if this were so, yet as our privileges far, far exceed those of the Jewish church, it would be a disgrace to us, if our offerings did not exceed theirs. But it is a mistake to suppose that the law of the tithe does not now bind. It existed ages before the Mosaic economy, and, of course, the dissolution of that economy affects it not. It is a patriarchal institution, ex-

isting in the earliest ages, honored by Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, ages before Moses was born—observed even by the Greeks, the Romans, and all heathen nations every where, who devote the tenth of their income to the service of religion. If this law has been abrogated, let the evidence be furnished, let the Scripture be produced. God's claims upon the Jewish church were numerous and heavy. Besides the tithes, there were the gifts; the meat-offerings, drink-offerings, firstlings, vast amounts for commemoration and consecration of events, persons, and things, and for the ransom of souls. Besides these, there were the sacrifices; burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings. So that it has been supposed, and with great probability, that the whole amount the Jews contributed could not have been less than one-third of all their income. And yet no community has ever been found on earth that was or is so prosperous, so rich as the Jewish community! Godliness is profitable for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come. What the Church of Christ most lacks, is faith in God. Her unbelief dishonors God, and impoverishes herself. Were it not for unbelief and covetousness, what advances might she not have made! Did her fidelity answer in any way to the transcendent position she occupies, and the glorious privileges she possesses, did she freely give as she has freely received, the dark places of the earth, which are now full of the habitations of cruelty, would long since have been illumined by the glorious sun of the Gospel; the conquests of divine truth would have been complete; the empire of Satan would be dismantled and overthrown; and the glorious shout would thunder through the temple of God, "Alleluia! The kingdoms of the earth are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ!"

Other subjects claim our attention in this paper, but the time already occupied forbids their introduction here.

We close this report by adverting to one duty peculiarly binding upon our church, the neglect of which will bring upon her the frown of God—the partial neglect of which has brought upon her the frown of God. We allude to the religious instruction of our slaves. This is the great duty of the church in this Confederacy—the evangelization of that great multitude which the providence of God has subjected to us by ties so near and strong. The highest interests of these immortal souls are not in their own keeping, but in ours. Their destiny for eternity is dependent, to a great extent, upon us. It becomes us to contemplate seriously and steadfastly the mighty responsibility. If our Southern Zion shall fully awake to the magnitude of this great work, and address itself diligently to its discharge, then will she receive the rich smiles of her Divine Head, and the abundant tokens of His favor; then will the relation of master and slave, as it obtains with us, be vindicated in the eyes of the world; and then will our beloved Confederacy occupy a pinnacle of moral grandeur, and become a praise and a blessing in all the earth!

ARTICLE V.

PSALMODY AND THE UNION.

It is not our purpose, in the present article, to discuss the question of Psalmody, which has so long divided the Presbyterian and Associate Reformed churches. While the relations of the two bodies are so friendly and harmonious, it would not be prudent to revive a controversy which has been conducted on both sides with considerable warmth, and, in some instances at least, resulted in still further estrangement. We do not propose, therefore, by an ill-timed discussion, to disturb the *entente cordiale* which now so happily prevails; but, on the contrary, it will be our design rather to cultivate this good understanding, and thus to promote the desire for union which both parties profess to entertain. And in adopting this conciliatory course, we we are not insensible to the claims of truth; for we are admonished by infallible wisdom that there is a time for all things, and that every thing is beautiful in its season.

The subject of union between the Presbyterian and Associate Reformed churches has been agitated more than twenty years. As early as 1842, a committee was appointed by the latter, in reference to this subject. From a careful examination of the facts developed by the negotiations from that period until the last meeting of Synod, at Sardis, in Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, it is evident that *progress* has been made; gradual, indeed, but very perceptible. It will be seen that both sides were, at the outset, exceedingly cautious and reserved; and that, in consequence of this untoward disposition, the first attempt at union resulted in failure and disappointment. Indeed, so unsatisfactory was the result to the smaller body, that the committee was discharged, and the negotiations abandoned. And so profound was the disappointment that,

during an interval of eight years, nothing further was attempted. When at length the subject was again brought up for consideration, in a presbyterial report, it was dismissed without even the formality of appointing a committee, on the ground that it was better to "await the leadings of Providence to determine the course of duty." So discouraging was the prospect of union at that time. And so the matter remained for the present.

The next attempt was more successful. In 1854, the cause of union found eloquent and powerful advocates in the Rev. Dr. Palmer and his colleague, the Rev. Mr. Banks, delegates from the Synod of South Carolina; who, in behalf of the body which they represented, renewed the proposal previously made with so little success; although the report of the committee to whom the matter was referred by Synod was unfavorable, yet the *animus* or tone of the paper which they submitted was far from discouraging. It concluded by recommending that a committee be appointed to correspond with a similar organ of the other body. This recommendation had the effect, at least, of reopening the negotiations, which had long been suspended.

The discussion at Due West, in 1858, was one of extraordinary interest. The General Assembly was represented in our Synod by the Rev. Dr. Howe and Chancellor Johnstone, to say nothing of the other members of the committee. The debate was opened by the Rev. N. M. Gordon, in a speech of great eloquence and ability, who was followed by the Rev. Dr. Boyce, in a luminous and powerful argument. It was continued the whole of the next day, by various speakers, without any abatement of interest, calling into requisition all the learning, talent, and zeal of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. Although no vote was taken, yet the discussion clearly developed the existence of a strong and growing sentiment in favor of union.

It is uncertain, however, when the subject would have been revived, but for that wonderful dispensation of divine providence, which has resulted in the disruption of the American Union. Under these peculiarly interesting and solemn circumstances the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America convened in the city of Augusta, Georgia, in December, 1861. It was soon apparent that a new and powerful impetus had been communicated to the negotiations on the subject of union, by the extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances in which the parties were placed. The great heart of the Assembly went forth spontaneously in the strongest expressions of love, confidence, and esteem for the sister church. In the exuberance of her Christian affection, she proposed to publish, in the beginning of her book, the entire one hundred and fifty Psalms in the version used by the Associate Reformed Church. This proposition, as might have been expected, has been entertained with great and decided favor in the other body. It was laid before the presbyteries; and, after favorable consideration, referred by them to the supreme court of the church, which, owing to providential hindrances, postponed final action for the present. These facts, we think, fully justify the opinion that progress has been made; and they give rise to a confident expectation that a harmonious union between these churches will, sooner or later, be effected. It would be very unfair to conclude that the committees to whom was intrusted the delicate and responsible task of inaugurating these negotiations were deficient either in ability or discretion. The true explanation, undoubtedly, is, that they encountered peculiar difficulties. At any other stage of the proceedings, there is reason to believe that the result would have been more satisfactory. In this, as in all other cases, *ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte.*

It is evident, in the second place, that obstacles exist of the most formidable character. When we reflect that these

negotiations have been in progress nearly a quarter of a century; that they have been in charge of zealous, able, and prudent men, whom their respective churches delight to honor; that they have been the subject of frequent deliberation in the highest ecclesiastical courts; that an earnest and sincere desire for union is entertained on both sides; and, lastly, when we consider that, although much has been accomplished, the object contemplated is not yet *un fait accompli*, we are constrained to admit that obstacles intervene of no ordinary magnitude. The reasons for the failure which has thus far attended all efforts at union, are not to be sought in the particular version of the Psalms which is used by one of the contracting parties. We are furnished with the most explicit and authoritative declarations to the contrary. The committee of the Assembly have assured us, again and again, that they had no objection to our time-honored version; that they had no desire to see it displaced; and, indeed, that they decidedly preferred treating with us on the basis of the existing metrical translation. And they have assured us that such were the sentiments of the body which they represented.*

If this were the real difficulty, surely a version might be prepared which would be acceptable to both churches; or such alterations and amendments might be made in that which is now in use, as to free it from all serious objections. To accomplish an object of so much importance, and one so ardently desired, as the union of these two branches of the household of faith, such a difficulty as that under consideration would be speedily overcome. We repeat it, the difficulty is not to be sought in the version of the Psalms used by the Associate Reformed Church, but in the Psalms themselves; that is, in the views which are entertained by that body on the subject of Psalmody. A

* See letter of Assembly's committee, in the Minutes of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South of 1858, p. 21.

version might be made which would be, in most respects, unobjectionable. It might be at once literal and elegant—this is at least conceivable—and yet, after all, we would be still as far as ever from the attainment of our object. If there were no version at all, good, bad, or indifferent, the case would not be affected in the slightest degree. It is this difficulty which has embarrassed the negotiations throughout, and which still exists in all its formidable dimensions.

In the third place, it is manifest that a union is believed to be practicable. As a general thing, men do not desire that which they believe to be unattainable. Now, there is abundant evidence in the history of these transactions—the *res gestæ*—that an earnest and sincere desire for union influences the parties concerned. We can not believe otherwise, unless we are prepared to accept as true the celebrated paradox of Talleyrand, that language is intended to *conceal* our thoughts. Again, if we do not desire, much less do we *pursue* with an ardor and perseverance which nothing can discourage, some *ignis fatuus*, or visionary project, which we are assured is utterly unattainable. We find it difficult to persuade ourselves that such men as compose the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church would persist in making offers which they were convinced it was impossible to accept; or, on the other hand, that they would be entertained and elaborately discussed, during a series of years, in the other body, when it was perfectly apparent that there remained no alternative but to reject them! *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.*

And we desire it to be distinctly remembered that all this must have been done with a full understanding of the real difficulties in the way of union. There may have been, and we think there was, more or less of misapprehension on this point, in the earlier periods of the negotiations, but there could have been none after that time. It is undeniable that these transactions, contemplating union, had their

origin in the conviction that such a measure was practicable; and were indebted for their continuance to the belief that it could be accomplished without a surrender of principle on either side. The very fact that propositions were submitted by one party and gravely discussed by the other, is proof unquestionable of this assertion. Either body being perfectly acquainted with the denominational peculiarities of the other, the inference is irresistible that, in the opinion of both, a union was not only practicable, but could be effected on *middle ground.*

It must have occurred to every one who has bestowed attention on the subject, that there are three possible ways in which a union may be effected between the Presbyterians and ourselves: 1. The surrender of the principle that, in the praise of God, the Church of Christ is confined to the use of the Inspired Psalter, or Psalms of David: 2. That, in addition to these Sacred Songs, she is at liberty to use others, composed by pious men, not under the special influences of the Spirit of inspiration; and, 3. The accepting by both churches of the fact of their difference in Psalmody. In other words, either the Associate Reformed Church must go over to the Presbyterian, or *vice versa;* or, lastly, they must meet on neutral territory.

It is manifest that a union is impracticable on the first or second basis. The history of these churches, and more especially of the recent negotiations, abundantly proves that each cherishes an unalterable attachment to its peculiar system of praise. The committee on union of the Associate Reformed Church, in their last report, declare that "The principle of an inspired Psalmody is *sacred* to us." The committee of the Assembly, in their last communication, use the following language: "We will continue to hope, until you shall inform us to the contrary, that among the terms you require of us, you will not press those principles so far as not to forbear with us, (either in union or intercommunion,) in our use of hymns." And a writer in

a recent number of this Quarterly expresses himself in the most energètic terms: "As to the fundamental question of *liberty*, we will not yield an inch, no, not to win a thousand churches." There is a very general, perhaps universal, conviction in the Associate Reformed Church, that the existing version, with its acknowledged merits, is in some respects defective; and attempts have been made, from time to time, to improve it, and even to secure a new version; but it does not follow from this that they are prepared to surrender the principle that the inspired Psalms are to be exclusively used in celebrating the praises of God. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that the General Assembly have never been fully satisfied with their book of praise. They have appointed committees, from time to time, as well as we, who have devoted *years* to the improvement of their Psalmody; and yet the result is far from satisfactory. The conclusion would be equally unwarrantable that they were prepared to discard their system of praise for that which is approved by the Associate Reformed Church.

The exclusive use of the inspired Psalter in the worship of God, both public and private, is, to borrow a technical term, the *differentia*, or specific difference, of the Associate Reformed Church. It is that which distinguishes her from the Presbyterian Church. If this distinction were obliterated, there would no longer be any reason for a separate and independent organization, so far as that church is concerned; on the well-known principle in law, *cessante ratione, cessat et ipsa lex.* In such a case, it would be the easiest thing in the world to arrange the preliminaries to an organic union. There would be no greater difficulty than in receiving members by certificate. No necessity could arise for tedious negotiations, like the present, which have "dragged their slow length along" nearly one generation. If, on the other hand, in the providence of God, Presbyterians should be brought to see eye to eye with

their Associate Reformed brethren on this subject, the union could be effected with just as little delay as in the former instance. It would be the work of a day or an hour.

It is certainly very desirable that they should be of one mind, of one accord, in this matter; but, as the Assembly's committee justly remark, we are speaking of what is attainable in the present state of the Christian Church. It is impossible for them to unite on the first or second basis, so long as they entertain their present sentiments in relation to Psalmody. And so far as appears from the record, (*quod literis exstet,*) there has been no change in either church affecting the principle in controversy. There may be individuals in the Presbyterian Church who, on the subject of Psalmody, entertain those peculiar views which are prevalent in the other body. If we have not been misinformed, there is, in the Synod of South Carolina, an entire congregation holding such sentiments, and conforming their practice to them. And there may be in the Associate Reformed Church, both among the ministers and others, those who, on this *quæstio vexata*, are not at variance with their brethren of the other denomination. But in either case, it is still true that the church, *as such*, maintains the principles indicated; and, therefore, it is impossible for either body to go into the union *en masse*, or as a whole, except on the third basis—that of forbearance.

It is clear, then, that if such expectations are indulged on either side, they must inevitably be disappointed. But we hazard nothing in affirming that such is not the fact. The resolutions of the First Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church declare: "We are in favor of a union with our Assembly brethren, if they consent to use and encourage, in all the congregations, the use of the Inspired Psalter, until it becomes the prevailing Psalmody of the United Church." Mark the language: not the exclusive, but the "*prevailing* Psalmody." The committee of the As-

sembly are equally explicit on this point: "We do not require you to abandon the Psalms, but, on the contrary, hold them as part of our Psalmody." Nay, their language is, if possible, still more unequivocal: "We require you neither to make such abandonment, nor to comply with any other terms or conditions whatever;" leaving the Associate Reformed Church to go into the union *lege solutam*, perfectly untrammelled. There can be no misunderstanding. The First Presbytery, distinguished among their brethren for the zeal and ability with which they advocate an inspired Psalmody, and a committee composed of such men as Dr. Howe, among the living, and the lamented Thornwell, have left no room for doubt.

But we need not confine ourselves to this part of the record. Is there any thing in the history of either body, antecedently to these negotiations, to encourage such an expectation? By the good hand of God upon her, the Associate Reformed Church in the South has been greatly prospered. She has lengthened her cords and strengthened her stakes. She has broken forth on the right hand and on the left. She has sent out her branches like the fruitful vine, or like the goodly cedar of Lebanon. She has gathered into her fold a numerous flock, although it may seem "little" among the thousands of Israel and the ten thousands of Judah. It is found in Virginia, in Texas, in Missouri, and all the intermediate States. Her bounds are coextensive with the broad limits of our glorious Southern Confederacy. But it is a remarkable fact that she has made few *proselytes*—we mean accessions from other religious denominations.* How far this is true of the other body, we are not prepared to say. But we make bold to affirm, that there is little in the history of the Associate Reformed Church, past or present, to encourage the former to antici-

* This remark is not intended to apply to those who were driven into her communion by the troubles growing out of the question of Psalmody.

pate such an accession to her numerical strength—to expect the acquisition of proselytes on so magnificent and altogether unprecedented a scale as is implied in the entire *absorption* of the sister church! Neither body is prepared as yet (if that period shall ever arrive, before the "watchmen shall lift up the voice together,") to adopt the views of the other; and, therefore, the union must be accomplished, if at all, on the last basis. Can a union, then, be formed on this plan? Would such a connexion involve the surrender, or even compromise, of cherished principles?

To answer this question satisfactorily, it must be remembered that the Psalmody of the United Church would consist of the songs of inspiration, and such human compositions, additional to these, as might be selected by the Assembly's committee. It would, consequently, be of a mixed character. Now, it is evident that, so far as the Presbyterians are concerned, there could not be the slightest difficulty. They do not object to the Psalms. They do not object even to Rouse. They claim the privilege of singing, in addition to the Bible Psalms, other songs, composed by uninspired men. The exclusive use of the Psalms is the ground of their controversy with us. They insist most vehemently that the Psalms are theirs as well as ours; they will not allow us a monopoly of the songs of Zion; they claim to have a version of these divine poems in their own book, not so literal, they readily grant, as the Scottish, but in other respects superior; and hence, to sing the Psalms of David in Rouse's version, or in any other, is perfectly consistent with their principles. This is too plain for argument. The only question that remains in connexion with this, is, Can the Associate Reformed Church go into the union, with a due regard to her principles and usages?

More than three-quarters of a century have elapsed since the church which bears this name had her origin in the union of two branches of the great Presbyterian family.

The memory of this event is perpetuated in the name which she assumed, and still retains. During this long period, nearly commensurate with that which has elapsed since the Declaration of Independence, she has maintained a separate organization. The synods North and West have recently effected a union with the Associate Synod, and these bodies are known at present as the United Presbyterian Church of North America. The Associate Reformed Synod of the South, since the year 1822, has been an independent organization. Of all the religious denominations, she was the first to yield to what Calhoun calls the "explosive force" of slavery, which has divided not only the American church, but the United States themselves into independent and hostile confederacies.*

The Associate Reformed Synod of the South has preserved her distinctive principles with great tenacity and firmness. She has not been ashamed of them, but, on all proper occasions, has avowed and maintained them as her peculiar praise. In her communion was reared the Rev. Dr. John T. Pressly, now of Allegheny, whose volume on Psalmody must convince the impartial inquirer that the practice of the church, in this respect, has not been without the most solid and weighty reasons. Those who have read the "Letters on Psalmody," by another minister who is still in her communion, must admit that he was well prepared to give a reason for his opinion; and that he has constructed an argument which must have commanded the respect of his opponent, with all his acknowledged learning and ability. And the discussion at Due West must have impressed every one whose privilege it was to be present with the belief that, in reference to this matter, the church was intelligent, as well as honest, in her convictions of

* Strictly speaking, the division in the Associate Reformed Church, South and North, was made on *geographical* considerations; but a subsequent attempt at reunion was rendered abortive by the question of slavery, which, if it did not cause, has at least *perpetuated* the schism.

duty; that she did not cherish an unreasonable attachment to a practice adopted without consideration, and perpetuated through prejudice, but was in possession of all the knowledge necessary to form an enlightened judgment in the premises.

Be this as it may—whether her practice in respect to Psalmody has been the result of prejudice, or is founded on reason, it has been uniform, and, with few exceptions, invariable. In celebrating the praises of God, she has confined herself, rigidly and exclusively, to the songs of inspiration; to the "words of David and Asaph the seer." And since the period of her independent organization, as well as before, she has deemed it a sufficient ground of separation from the Presbyterian Church. The prevailing opinion has, undoubtedly, been that a union with the Presbyterian Church would be incompatible with fidelity to her cherished principles; and hence she has persistently stood aloof from all the friendly overtures of that pious and venerable body.

When the fathers of the Secession, Erskine, Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, withdrew, in 1734, from the communion of the Church of Scotland, they made a statement of the reasons which impelled them to the separation. Of these reasons, none, so far as we know, have ever been assigned by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South as the ground of her separation from the Presbyterian Church, either in the United or Confederate States of America. They were peculiar to the Scottish establishment, and have long since passed away. That charity which believeth all things, forbids the conclusion that she would have persisted in maintaining a separate organization, without any satisfactory reason. Is it assuming too much to affirm that her ministers and people are inferior to none in the estimate which they place upon the importance of union? Toward the Presbyterian Church, especially, she has been sensible of a powerful and peculiar attraction. Being of the same

illustrious parentage with her, substantially one in faith and practice, cherishing an affectionate remembrance of common sufferings and dangers in the cause of civil and religious liberty, it is not at all strange that she should have been so powerfully impelled to unite with that beloved church. It is certain that nothing but a stern and imperious sense of duty could have enabled her to decline the repeated advances which have been made by the other party. Had a union, in her judgment, been practicable without a surrender of important principles, it is a breach of Christian charity to suppose it would not long since have been effected. The conviction that Psalmody was a sufficient ground of separation; in other words, that it could not be made a matter of forbearance, has hitherto operated as an insurmountable barrier to union. Does this obstacle exist at present?

We have seen that the Associate Reformed Church still maintains her principles; that she has not departed from the faith of the fathers, but is still walking in the old paths. On this point, there can, we think, be no reasonable doubt. But in one respect, we are clearly of the opinion that there has been a change. If we are not very much mistaken, she has yielded the position that Psalmody is a sufficient ground of separation; or, to express the same thought in a different form, she is now willing to make it a matter of forbearance. We have arrived at this conclusion after a most careful and patient examination of the facts, if, indeed, it is not self-evident; for what propriety could there be in any further overtures on the subject, without a mutual understanding to this effect? It is admitted, however, that it is only in the subsequent stages of the negotiations, she has been disposed to concede so much. The committee on union, in 1854, in reply to the proposal from the Synod of South Carolina, declare that "with our present sentiments on these points, (Psalmody and communion,) we could not, in our judgment, consistently go into

the union." This paper was adopted; hence, there can be no doubt that such was the position of the Synod at that time. But it is manifest that some change must have taken place in the public sentiment before the meeting of Synod at Due West, in 1858, or within a period of four years. The report of the majority of the committee on union merely complains that sufficient *prominence* had not been given to the principle of an inspired Psalmody, expressly leaving the way open for further negotiations. The report of the minority proposes a basis in which the principle of forbearance is distinctly recognized. In consequence of the indefinite postponement of the whole subject, neither of these reports was adopted; but the discussion to which they gave rise, as well as the character of the papers themselves, afforded unmistakable indications of a change—shall we not rather say, revolution—in the sentiment of the church.

But the favor with which the proposition of the Assembly has been received in the primary courts of the church, makes it morally certain that she is prepared to go into the union on the principle of forbearance. The reports of so many of the presbyteries as had the subject under consideration, that is, a majority, are clearly in favor of the application of this principle to the case in hand. The deliverance of the Second Presbytery is most explicit: "We will yield to our Presbyterian brethren the privilege of using Paraphrases and Hymns." The First Presbytery are willing to go into the union, provided the use of the Psalms be encouraged by the ministers and people of the Presbyterian Church, until they become the "*prevailing* Psalmody of the United Church." The report of the Alabama Presbytery is in more general terms, but plainly recognizes the principle in question. It expresses an earnest desire that the union "may be formed, and without damage to the principles or feelings of either party." It is not easy to understand how such a union could be formed without the exercise of for-

bearance. The Georgia Presbytery declare themselves in favor of union on the basis of the Assembly's proposition, as they understand it, viz., "first, the Sacred Psalter, then Paraphrases and Hymns." The Virginia Presbytery are willing to *forbear* with their Presbyterian brethren "in the use of Select Hymns and Paraphrases." The Tennessee and Kentucky Presbyteries, it seems, submitted verbal reports to the same purport. Owing to the absence of a majority of her ministers, the Memphis Presbytery declined taking any action in the premises. The Arkansas Presbytery was not represented.

If these courts represent the sentiment of the church, it is impossible to doubt that the principle of forbearance has received a public and formal recognition. The chairman of the committee on union gives the substance of these papers, when he says: "They (the Presbyteries) profess to entertain an earnest desire that a harmonious union between this church and our own may be effected, and a willingness to form a union as early as the preliminaries can be satisfactorily arranged." Thus it appears that the most formidable obstacle to union has been removed; that is to say, the conviction entertained, by one of the parties, that it could be effected only at the expense of principle. This obstacle was encountered at the very threshold of the negotiations, and, from its nature, was absolutely insurmountable. All that is necessary now to the consummation of the union is the satisfactory arrangement of the preliminaries. Of these, the most important is the preparation of a book of praise which shall be acceptable to both churches.

Hence, we are not required to discuss the question which we proposed to ourselves: *Can* the Associate Reformed Church go into the union, with a due regard to her principles and usages? This question she has decided for herself. It is no longer *res integra.*

To remove, as far as practicable, the difficulties which still obstruct the negotiations, the Assembly propose to incor-

porate the version of the Psalms commonly known as Rouse's, with their own book of praise. They also propose to improve their Psalmody by a "vigorous process" of pruning and lopping, "omitting a great deal, at least one-half." To accomplish this important and delicate work, a committee of five, with Dr. Palmer as chairman, was appointed at the meeting of the Assembly in Augusta.

These hints enable us to form a tolerably correct estimate of the character of the book which it is the province of this committee to submit to the Assembly. It will consist, in the first place, of the entire one hundred and fifty Psalms in Rouse's version, or in any other which may be acceptable to the smaller body; and, secondly, of such Hymns and Paraphrases as may survive that vigorous process of pruning and lopping recommended to the committee. We are unable, of course, to determine the exact proportion of the two elements which are expected to enter into the composition of the new Psalter; but it may be confidently assumed that the number of hymns will not be so great by much as it is at present. Not only will the number of hymns be greatly reduced, but there is also reason to believe that their character will be more scriptural. The conviction seems to be gaining ground in the Assembly, that, while in the duty of praise the Church of Christ is not confined to the very words of inspiration, the *matter* of it ought to be directly derived from the revealed word of God. If we are not very much at fault, the recent history of this venerable body will bear us out in this assertion.

In like manner, the Associate Reformed Synod has appointed a committee of five, with Dr. Grier as chairman, to prepare a new version of the Psalms. The Assembly do not insist on this as an indispensable preliminary; but, independently of the question of union, it is certainly a very desirable object. No one, we presume, will carry his partiality for the present version so far as to maintain that it is absolutely perfect.

Such will probably be the character of the book which the committees are expected to submit to their respective churches, for their approval or condemnation. It will be a *tertium quid*, differing from both of its predecessors, and better adapted to the somewhat heterogeneous character of the United Church. Assuming that the churches are prepared for union on the basis of forbearance, we proceed to inquire, Will such a book as that which is here contemplated be satisfactory?

As already intimated, we have no reason to anticipate an unfavorable decision on the part of the Presbyterians. They do not reject the Psalms. They merely claim the privilege of singing, in addition to these, songs composed by uninspired men. Again, as the proposition emanated from the Assembly, it would be absurd to suppose that it would be rejected as soon as realized and embodied in a form prescribed by themselves. Of course, they are to judge of the ability and faithfulness with which their committee shall have performed its appropriate work; but, from the character of the men composing it, we have no doubt that the task will be eminently well performed, and that the performance will be entirely satisfactory. But will the book of praise be acceptable to the other body?

To give an intelligent answer to this question, it will be necessary to consider carefully the tenor and purport of the Assembly's proposition. The Associate Reformed Church is very jealous of the honor of the inspired Psalter. Hence she is not willing to see it assume an equivocal position in the Psalmody of the United Church—much less entirely supplanted. What, then, does the Assembly propose as a basis of union? As there seems to be some doubt as to the real meaning and intent of the proposition, we submit the following comment from a perfectly authentic source: "Here are two churches at one except on Psalmody. If they are to unite, they must have a common Psalmody. It is proposed to provide this by putting your Psalms and our Psalms

and Hymns together. Neither of the two being prepared to adopt the other's principles, we agree to disagree, and, leaving the question of Psalmody in abeyance, to join our books of praise together. Each church is to be at liberty to use either portion, and any minister of the United Church will always be able to find such sacred songs for the praise of God as will suit him and the people to whom he preaches." What, then, will be the effect of a union, on the terms here proposed? Will the Psalms become more popular in the United Church, or will they gradually fall into disuse, even in that portion of it which now uses them to the exclusion of all other songs?

Nothing is more certain than that the Associate Reformed Church is not willing to part with the Psalms, as a *preliminary* to union. Had such a condition been insisted on as an indispensable prerequisite, the negotiations would have been abandoned long since as perfectly preposterous; for they could not have been prosecuted with the least hope of success. She is still as much attached as ever to her peculiar system of praise. The agitation of the subject has only confirmed her in the resolution to abide by her principles; to guard with a jealous vigilance those sacred songs which have fed the flame of devotion in every age of the church; and to transmit them unimpaired, as an invaluable legacy, from generation to generation.

If she will not agree to make so costly a sacrifice in advance, as the price of union, it follows that she will not knowingly do any thing *leading by necessary steps to such a result.* The event would be the same in either case. It would be merely a question of time. It will also follow that if the Assembly have not felt themselves at liberty, (as manifestly they have not,) to require such a concession as a preliminary to union, they can not consistently invite their brethren into an alliance of which this would be the necessary and inevitable consequence. Hence, we are compelled to believe that, in their opinion, no such result

would ensue. And this fact of itself affords no little security against such a contingency. The opinion of such a body of Christians is certainly entitled to great consideration. Has the Associate Reformed Church, then, any sufficient ground for believing that this opinion is erroneous; that the Psalms would, in fact, be speedily supplanted in the United Church by their more popular rivals, and uninspired compositions become not only the predominant, but exclusive element of praise? This is the question which the Associate Reformed Church, in the providence of God, is now called upon to decide.

The fact can not be disguised that, in the minds of many in her communion, who are not at all averse to the measure in contemplation *per se*, considerable apprehension exists that the Psalms would suffer by the union; and hence, they are disposed to regard it in the light of a somewhat doubtful experiment. This fear, they think, is justified by the fact that the advocates of the Psalms, (meaning, it is hardly necessary to observe, their exclusive use,) would constitute, numerically, a small element in the United Church; and hence, it is apprehended, would not be able to resist successfully the influence of the majority, which, it is taken for granted, would be exerted in favor of human composition. This influence is already felt to a considerable extent, as the churches are at present related; and they apprehend it would be greatly increased when they should have become ecclesiastically one. On the other side, not a few are hopeful that the Psalms would not only maintain their present ground, but, to adopt a military phrase, make successful inroads into the neighboring territory; until, to change our metaphor, a little leaven should pervade the whole lump. If the smaller body has felt the influence of the larger, which is undeniable, it is equally true that the latter has not been altogether insensible to the influence of the former. This is shown by the fact that the Assembly already have in their book fifty-two of

the Psalms used by the Associate Reformed Church; and this, be it understood, not with any reference to union. This fact has some significance, and will assist us in estimating the probable effect of union on the use of the Psalms. There is another fact which should be remembered in connexion with this. At the last meeting of the Assembly but one, "it was *universally* conceded," says Dr. Lyon, "that our church Psalmody stood greatly in need of revision;" and that, as the result of this process, "at least one-half" should be omitted.* These facts taken together, viz., that the Assembly already have in their book more than one-third of our Psalms, and now propose, without a dissenting voice, to omit at least one-half of their Hymns, and this without any reference to union, prove that powerful influences have been at work, from whatever source they may have emanated; and we think there is no presumption in claiming that among the causes which have conspired to produce this general result, the example of the Associate Reformed Church has not been the least considerable. Will not this influence be exerted more powerfully and steadily, and lead to still more gratifying results, when the union shall have been consummated?

There are some other historical facts, not of so recent a date, bearing upon this question in both of its aspects. The Psalms, together with Paraphrases and Hymns, have long been used in the Church of Scotland, without that result which is apprehended in the present case. This example should tend to quiet the apprehension that the use of Paraphrases and Hymns, under any circumstances, necessarily results in the disesteem and neglect of the Psalms.

In the other aspect of the question, we are confronted by the stubborn fact that the Psalms, that is to say, a *literal* version, have for many years been disused in the Presbyterian Church; the very body which proposes to unite with

* Southern Presbyterian Review, Vol. XIV., p. 660.

us on the basis which we are now discussing. If, when they constituted the principal Psalmody of the church, they were set aside, and another system introduced, is it not exceedingly improbable that, after having been so long discarded, they will again come into general use among Presbyterians, or, indeed, be used by them at all? So far from this, is there not great danger that they will, in the sequel, be used by neither, and thus suffer a second *ostracism* from the church? But does it follow, the friends of this measure might reply, that because an event occurred many years since, under one set of circumstances, therefore it must occur again, under a new and very different combination? We believe it is Bacon who says: *tempus maximus est innovator.* We are far from asserting that any change has taken place in the Presbyterian Church on the subject of Psalmody, so far as the *principle* is concerned; or that the proposition of the Assembly proceeded from new views. We do not so understand the matter; but we more than suspect that there *does* exist among them a growing dissatisfaction with their Hymns, and a disposition to return to the practice of "the good old mother Church of Scotland and Ireland." There is another consideration. Both churches expect to be benefited by the union; the Presbyterian as well as the Associate Reformed. If the union is advantageous to the former, it will be both her duty and interest to maintain it. But the bond of union is the use of the Psalms of David in the United Church. Therefore, it will be both the duty and interest of the Presbyterian Church to encourage the use of the Psalms.

In this way, and this alone, can the harmony of the United Church be preserved. The general neglect of the Psalms would very soon result in a rupture, with all its attendant evils.

We have thus presented, in a very general manner, and without any attempt at discussion, some considerations which may be of assistance in enabling us to decide the

question, What will be the effect of union on the Psalms; will it be favorable or unfavorable? This passage may appear somewhat irrelevant to the readers of this Review, as the decision of this question belongs to ourselves; but we desire to call the attention of our Presbyterian brethren to some of the difficulties which environ the subject, as it now presents itself to the Associate Reformed Church.

Upon the whole, there can, we think, be no great difficulty in defining the present position of this church on the subject of Psalmody. Formerly, the question was, Can we go into the union *at all?* It now is, Can we accept the Assembly's proposition? Does it afford any assurance that the Psalms will continue to be sung? Formerly, it was a question of *forbearance.* Now, it is a question of the *permanent use* of the Psalms. The only difficulty now to be encountered is, the apprehension which exists, to some extent, in the minds of all, that in acceding to the proposition of the Assembly, we hazard the principle that the Psalms were designed by their Author to be permanently used in the church, and are eminently proper for this purpose. And we take it upon ourselves to affirm that no arrangement will be satisfactory to the smaller body, which does not contain some well-grounded assurance that the Psalms will be permanently used in the United Church.

We desire not to be misunderstood. By assurance, we do not mean a pledge, or a compulsory use of the Psalms. Both churches are to be left free. Our meaning is this: *The character of the Psalmody recommended to the United Church shall be so nearly conformed to that of the Church of Scotland, as to afford some reasonable prospect of a similar result.*

To be more precise: we do not think the human element, (we use the word in no offensive sense,) ought largely, if at all, to preponderate. If the number of Hymns and Paraphrases greatly exceed that of the Psalms, this circumstance will impart to the former an air of superior importance, and this seeming preference will operate to the disadvantage

of the latter. In our judgment, therefore, the inequality should not be nearly so great as it is at present. This suggestion, which might otherwise appear presumptuous, is made with the more confidence, inasmuch as the Assembly themselves have, from time to time, reduced the number of their Hymns, and now propose to make still further reduction, not with a view to union, but for the improvement of their Psalter. Poetry is one of those things in which quality is more to be regarded than quantity. And this is emphatically true of devotional poetry. A volume which consists of five hundred or a thousand Hymns is not, for that reason, superior to another which contains only half the number. The exquisitely beautiful Hymns of Cowper, particularly that touching one which sounds the depths of every pious heart:

> "O for a closer walk with God,
> A calm and heavenly frame!"

or Dryden's magnificent paraphrase, worthy of Milton himself, of the grand old lyric, *Veni Creator Spiritus:*

> "Creator Spirit, by whose aid
> The world's foundations first were laid!"—

a volume composed of such songs as these, although it might not be very bulky or pretentious, would be of far greater value than a much larger collection of decidedly inferior merit. We do not desire to be understood as intimating that the collection which obtains in the Presbyterian Church is of the latter character. Far from it. Many of them have stood the test of time, and, like sandal-wood, continue to shed a precious perfume, which rejoices the heart. They are enshrined in the affections of God's people, and have become, as it were, a part of their spiritual being. But are we guilty of presumption or intrusion, if we echo the voice of the whole Presbyterian Church, which declares that many, very many, are not up to this high standard, and have a place in the collection only by sufferance?

Under cover, therefore, of this recommendation of the Assembly, we have no hesitation in saying that such a reduction would go far to reconcile the Associate Reformed Church to the Presbyterian Psalter.

Suffer another remark. Our people would much prefer that the Hymns should be of a more *scriptural* character. And here, again, we must beg that we may not be misunderstood. We disclaim any intention to insinuate that the sentiment of the Hymns, or any of them, used in the Presbyterian Church, is unscriptural. We have no reason to believe that their Psalter is not perfectly *orthodox*. But the sentiment of a Hymn may be unexceptionable, and, at the same time, in the sense here intended, not scriptural. The sentiment of "Paradise Lost" is, with rare exceptions, unobjectionable; but we can not affirm that it is directly or immediately derived from the Scriptures of truth. The "Course of Time" is, in a higher sense, a religious poem. It could not have been written, had the heart of the author not been thoroughly imbued with divine truth, which often finds its most appropriate utterance in the very words of inspiration. Much of the sentiment of this poem is scriptural, because it is borrowed from the inspired writers; and the language also partakes of the same character for precisely the same reason. If a collection of sacred songs were composed on this model, with such differences as are required between the epic poem and the ode, it would afford some idea of what we understand by a scriptural Psalmody. A paraphrase is a versification of some particular portion of Scripture. The sentiment of a hymn, or spiritual song, such as we have in view, might be taken *ad libitum* from any portion of the sacred volume, with unlimited freedom of selection from its rich and inexhaustible stores. The "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," which are scattered up and down, with magnificent profusion, by the sacred historians and poets, by prophets and evangelists, and other holy men of old, would be appropriated without

stint by the author of such a composition. It would be something between a paraphrase and what is generally understood by a hymn. The sentiment, and even the language, would be adopted, as nearly as might be without making a paraphrase or translation. A literal version of the Psalms, as a *point d'appui*, or foundation; next, paraphrases, either of the Psalms themselves, or of other portions of Scripture; and, lastly, hymns, the sentiment of which should be eminently scriptural, and expressed, as nearly as convenient, in the language which the Holy Spirit indited, would, in our opinion, meet the requirements of the case, constituting a broad platform, with "ample room and verge enough," on which both churches might safely and comfortably stand. Such a collection would possess a more homogeneous character than a volume composed of Psalms, together with hymns written without any regard to these restrictions. And being of this character, there would not be the same danger of *exclusive preference*. The sentiment would be the same in all, substantially, with greater or less freedom of expression. In the Psalms, the mind of the Spirit would be expressed in His own language, so far as this is possible in a metrical version; while in the Paraphrases and Hymns, the *sentiment*, (and the language also, to a certain extent,) would be scriptural; not only agreeable to the word of God, but, in its *substance*, directly derived from it. Thus the same spiritual palate which received gratification from the latter, would not be so likely to conceive a disgust at the former, because, to pursue our metaphor, there was not so much spice and seasoning.

From all which we conclude that, if the hymns were of a more scriptural character, as well as fewer in number, the probability of an early union would be increased. We have made these suggestions with great diffidence, and should not have presumed so far, but for the persuasion that we have been anticipated by the General Assembly. If they were prepared, as we have seen, to make these

changes without any reference to union, they will not take it unkindly if we recommend them, with this important object in view.

What the Associate Reformed Church desires is, *that the Psalms shall constitute an indispensable and essential part of the book of praise in the United Church.* And surely this is a moderate and reasonable demand. If she go into the union, she desires to do so with the distinct understanding that the Psalms—not Rouse, but the word of God, that liveth and abideth for ever—shall be "part and parcel" of the common Psalter, as long as the connexion shall be maintained. She is "willing and desires" to enter into the union, but not at the expense of those celestial songs which the sweet Psalmist of Israel, in his seasons of exultation and despondency, was wont to accompany with his "harp of solemn sound, and grave, sweet melody." Whatever importance she may attach to union, abstractly considered, she will never, for the sake of accomplishing it, surrender her distinctive principles, which have given her character and individuality in the great Presbyterian family.

The present is the most favorable opportunity for consummating the union that, in the providence of God, has yet been presented. In 1852, as we have seen, the Associate Reformed Church resolved to "await the leadings of Providence to determine the course of duty." This was, no doubt, a wise conclusion. But a few years have elapsed, (only one short decade,) and what a change! A mighty revolution has been accomplished. Its effects have not been confined to the State. The Church, also, has been deeply agitated by these political convulsions. By the blessing of God, aided by her own prudence and wisdom, the Presbyterian Church had been able to preserve her unity, and, to a considerable extent, her peace, in the midst of the division and strife which distracted the counsels of the nation. At length, however, in the fervent heat which

dissolved the political elements, ecclesiastical ties fell asunder as flax at the touch of fire. The Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America became a separate, complete, and independent organization. No sooner was this change in her relations effected, than she was powerfully drawn toward other branches of the Presbyterian family in the South; and especially toward the Associate Reformed Church, with whom she had long been conducting a friendly correspondence.

It is wonderful to contemplate the effects of this gigantic revolution in moulding and harmonizing public sentiment at the South, both in Church and State. It has united the people of the South as one man in fierce and unconquerable opposition to the tyranny of the North. Never before, perhaps, in the history of our race, has any great popular movement been characterized by more unanimity. Party lines, which time had deeply drawn, have disappeared as foot-prints before the rising tide. The animosities of the past have been buried and forgotten. In the majestic language of the prophet, the hearts of the people have been bowed as the winds bow the trees of the forest. The inhabitants of these Confederate States present to the world the sublime spectacle of a whole people rising up as one man to vindicate their insulted majesty, and to establish upon a new basis the immutable principles of justice.

The Southern Church has no less distinctly felt the tremors of this political earthquake. She is beginning to recognize, as perhaps she never did before, the great and paramount truth that in Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free. And hence, denominational distinctions do not assume that undue importance which we are so prone to attach to them in seasons of profound peace and tranquillity.* Christians

* "While the great doctrines which distinguish revealed religion are attended with such evidence that to reject them is a crime, we can not say the same of those minor forms which divide one denomination from

of the different persuasions are brought into more intimate association with each other, in their common efforts to provide for the wants of our destitute soldiery. Not unfrequently they meet together in circumstances well adapted to chasten and subdue the mind, and moderate the zeal of party. They are found side by side and shoulder to shoulder, on the tented field, upholding the honor of our common flag, now full high advanced in the sight of the nations. The ministers of every communion are united in a common labor of love—proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ in the cheerless hospital or under the broad canopy of heaven. It were passing strange if in such circumstances they were not more than ordinarily disposed to regard each other as brethren in Christ, engaged in the same glorious work, which is to promote, according to their several ability, the spiritual and everlasting well-being of their common countrymen. If this is true of the Church in general, it is emphatically true of those different divisions which are marshalled under the broad banner of the Presbyterian faith and polity. And with yet greater emphasis may it be affirmed of those two branches of this numerous and important family, which, during a series of years have been actively negotiating in reference to union. Hence it behooves both, under a deep and solemn sense of their accountability to God, to consider whether, in "the leadings of Providence," the path of duty is not *now* plain before them.

It is a remarkable fact that the Associate Reformed Church had her origin near the close of the first American Revolution. The political sky was still overcast, but the

---

another. On this debatable, or at least debated ground, we may agree to differ. In seasons of controversy, we magnify these topics, until enmities are begotten which remain for a generation. It is some times a blessing when some foreign enemy attacks our common faith, and when, contending for one common cause, we bury our enmities, and remember that we are brethren." *Sermon before State Bible Convention*, by the Rev. Dr. Howe.

clouds had a silver lining; the night was not yet gone, but the morning of a glorious day was beginning to "purple the east." The foundations of our beloved Zion were laid in troublous times:

> "In darkness, and with danger compass'd round;"

but, like the fabled Minerva, she sprang from the vortex of revolution, clothed in her celestial panoply. It may be the purpose of the Head of the Church, that the union which is now in contemplation shall be formed under circumstances nearly similar. Although it is impossible to predict the duration of the terrible conflict in which we are engaged, we have yet a strong persuasion that the Lord will cut it short in righteousness; that He will arise to shake terribly the earth; and that our enemies will experience as signal an overthrow as the haughty king of Assyria, when he came up against Jerusalem and Hezekiah, with his hitherto invincible legions!

There is a tide in the affairs of men; and if we would "take it at the flood," let us avail ourselves of the present auspicious moment. There is danger in delay. There is no reason to believe that the parties will ever be more favorably disposed. If they fail to improve the present opportunity, both will naturally settle down in the conviction that the difficulties are of such a nature as absolutely to forbid all further communication on the subject. Let both, then, rise to the grandeur of the occasion, which rebukes all selfish and mercenary considerations. The motives which should influence the contracting parties, tower immeasurably above all schemes of denominational aggrandizement. The grand design of the union should be to promote the peace and harmony of the Church, with a view to the glory of God, the honor of Christ, and the salvation of immortal souls.

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 4.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDICATED.

"Whatsoever," saith the divine oracle, "is not of faith," that is, whatever we do, as moral and responsible beings, that is not based upon a well-grounded conviction of its rectitude, "is sin." Where there is a faithful and enlightened conscience, it will regard such conduct, whether it involves commission of what is wrong, or failure to do what is right, with self-condemnation; and the result of such a state of mind must be doubt, irresolution, and imbecility.

It is all-important, therefore, not only to act right, but to *know* that we are doing so, in order to do and to dare, to endeavor and to endure, to perform and to persevere in doing, all that, as men, we can achieve. A mind conscious of its sincerity of purpose, and of the righteousness of its desired end—of having a good cause, and justifiable means for its accomplishment—is essential to success. This alone

can now animate and sustain the people of the South, whether in the army or out of it, in the patient endurance of past misfortunes, present calamities, and possibly increasing difficulties and dangers.

Such a faith will be found to have constituted the vitalizing principle of all successful wars, the secret power of all celebrated warriors; the soul of the Reformation, and the indomitable spirit of our revolutionary fathers.

We have seen, therefore, with what witchcraft the North has succeeded in leading its people so generally to believe that our cause is wicked, and theirs righteous, sacred, holy, divine. We are rebels, traitors, criminals, execrable sinners, and deserving the uttermost punishment on earth, and everlasting damnation in hell. The highest sanctions of piety and patriotism have been made to overcome all natural feelings of sympathy and compassion; to inflame malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness; to call down fire from heaven to destroy us; to sustain their present government in its suppression of all their own liberties and fundamental rights, of all freedom of speech, of the press, and even of thought; and to overwhelm them with a debt of many hundred millions of dollars, and increasing at the rate of six millions a day; and to justify a war of rapine, rape, murder, vandal destruction, inquisitorial espionage, ecclesiastical despotism, and servile massacre. Our enemies, it must be admitted, display terrible earnestness, and almost superhuman malevolence. They have a zeal of God, but it is not according to knowledge. Their faith is, therefore, fanaticism. They substitute opinion for truth, dogmatism for doctrine, philosophy (falsely so called) for religion; and, adopting as a maxim the jesuitical dogma that the end sanctifies the means, they stop at nothing, and are willing to be branded by an outraged world as infamous, for their mendacity, perfidy, shameless brutality, and an unbridled despotism, more execrable than that of Bomba, if by any means they can subjugate and enslave the South.

What melancholy evidence of the overwhelming force of this fanatical fury, and of its blinding delusion, is given in the transformation effected in the principles and character and conduct of such men as Drs. R. J. Breckinridge, Spring, Hodge, Jacobus, and Plumer, and Sidney A. Morse, Mr. Dickinson, etc. Such men now profess to have lost confidence in our morality. And well may they and we alike lose any confidence we ever had either in the sincerity, uprightness, or power of the human mind, and even in Christian principle, in its present imperfect development. Well may we say, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man;" for surely the wisdom of the wise has become foolishness, and the purity of the pure tainted with the corruption of selfish and sectional prejudice.

To this blind, fervid fanaticism, the South must oppose the only invincible shield, and that is faith, faith in God, faith in His word, faith in His omnipotent providence, faith in the righteousness of a cause sustained by His immutable and everlasting truth. She must be able to give a reason for the hope that is in her, to herself and to every one that asketh it, that so, being clad in divine panoply, she may be able to withstand in the evil day, and bear up, with unshrinking fortitude, against the heart-sickness of long-deferred hope, and the manifold disappointments, disasters, privations, losses, and bereavements of a protracted and barbarous war.

I. THE WAR OF THE SOUTH IS IN SELF-DEFENCE.

Now, for such a faith there is adequate foundation, in the first place, in the defensive character of the war of the South. That war, as we have already proved,* was provoked, threatened, perfidiously commenced, and openly proclaimed by the North; and as sure as there is a righteous God, they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.

---

* See the article on the Battle of Fort Sumter, in the Review for 1861

Accursed by God are they that delight in war. For the battle is not to the strong, nor victory by might, or power, or wisdom, but by God's providence, who giveth it to whomsoever He will; saving by few or many, as it pleaseth Him, and executing judgment for the poor and oppressed.

Should any doubt attach to the conclusiveness of the facts adduced, in proof of the aggression of the North in originating this war, it will be more than silenced by the correspondence, since made public, between Governor Pickens and the United States Government, and between that Government and its own foreign Ambassadors, and by General Scott's letters; in all of which it is incontrovertibly shown that the whole scheme of a perfidious attack upon Charleston, by Fort Sumter within, and a fleet without the harbor, was actually arranged by that Government at the very time it was giving Governor Pickens solemn assurances of peaceful intentions, and of the early evacuation of the fort.

By every instinct, therefore, of self-preservation and defence, by the divinely authorized as well as inherent natural right of all her citizens in the government ordained by them, as "free," and "using their liberty," (1 Pet. 2,) the South was imperatively required to defend life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, even unto blood, against the arrogant and rapacious usurpation and tyranny of the North.

Coming events, now a part of history, cast their shadows before, and the portentous magnitude and character of this war darkened with their terrific shade the perilous course of a Southern Confederacy. But God's manifest presence and providence, in the bloodless and yet triumphant victory of Sumter; in the electric sympathy with which eleven States rushed into each others' arms; in the peaceful, prayerful unity with which a constitution and a confederation were ratified on earth, and sealed in the chancery of heaven; all this seemed to be the evidence of God's presence with us.

God seemed thus to command His people in these Southern States, to whom, as the divider of nations, He had apportioned their inheritance, and imposed upon them the solemn trust of an organized system of slave labor, for the benefit of the world and as a blessing to themselves, while imparting civil, social, and religious blessings to their slaves; now that His word and providence were denied, and covenanted rights and immunities were withheld, and the annihilation of that system of labor was made the basis and cohesive bond of a dominant mobocratic and sectional party, inaugurated as the government of the United States, and invested with absolute power, God now spake as with a voice from heaven, saying, "Come out of the Union, my people. From such withdraw thyself, for 'all the men of thy Confederacy have brought thee even to the border: the men that were at peace with thee have deceived thee, and prevailed against thee: they that ate thy bread have laid a wound under thee: there is none understanding in them.'" The heart of the South was bowed before the Most High, the Lord God omnipotent that reigneth, and with one voice they cried unto Him, and said unto Him, "If thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence: for wherein shall it be known that we, thy people, have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated from all the people that are upon the face of the earth." Then came up from millions of hearts the shout, "Go forward, for God is with us of a truth."

But Abraham Lincoln neither heard nor heeded this voice that spake so audibly from heaven, in the otherwise inexplicable events that were occurring around him. He hardened his heart, and stiffened his neck, and would not let the people go. The Constitution of the United States must be set aside, and all rights under it, however fundamental, ignored. The collateral power of the Supreme Court is denied, and its decisions set at nought. The powers of an autocratic despotism are assumed. War, war to the hilt, a war of sub-

jugation or extermination, is proclaimed. Beauty and booty became the earliest war-cry. Murderers, thieves, and the veriest offscourings of jails and cities, were consecrated to their work of lust and rapine by woman's benediction, and the grasp of hands reeking with pollution, and were canonized in advance by priestly absolution. Edicts have been issued, and practically carried out, under the sanction of the government, which, for brutality and ferocity, have thrown into the shade the infamy alike of Bomba and of Alva. A President, not the choice of the people—having a majority against him of two-thirds of a million out of four millions, even in the Northern States, while from the Susquehanna to the Rio Grande, in fifteen States, neither a popular nor electoral vote was given him, and who only became President under, and in subordination to, that very Constitution now trampled beneath his feet—has, by the arbitrary and despotic exercise of illegal and unconstitutional power, rendered the United States Government, as one of their own orators is reported to have well said, "the most contemptible on the face of the earth."

What, then, was the South to do? What could she do, but declare, with Patrick Henry, "resistance to tyrants is obedience to God;" buckle on her armor, and contend to the last extremity, to the last man, and to the last dollar, for "the redemption of our country from all impending slavery?" We have taken up arms for the defence of our civil and religious rights, and God, our country, and the world at large, call upon us to quit ourselves like men, for our wives and little ones, for our homes, our sanctuaries, and even our religion itself.

II. THE WAR OF THE SOUTH VINDINCATED BY THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN LIBERTY.

The war of the South is vindicated by those principles of civil liberty and free government acknowledged by our forefathers, and by our enemies, and imbedded in the fun-

damental charters of our national and constitutional rights.

The principles which entered into the controversies and struggles of our revolutionary fathers, were found in the works of Locke, Hoadley, Sydney, Montesquieu, Priestley, Milton, Price, and Gordon's Tacitus, which were all in Franklin's library. Pitt declared "the American controversy to be a great common cause, and that if she fell she would embrace the pillars of the State, and pull down the Constitution with her." "The natural rights of man, and the immutable laws of nature," said Lord Camden, "are with that people." General Burgoyne declared in Parliament, in 1781, that "he was now convinced that the principle of the war against America was wrong;—* * * only a part of a system levelled against the Constitution and the natural rights of mankind." The high-minded men of that day rejoiced in our resistance to tyranny. "The Englishman in America," says Burke, "will feel that to bear the burden of unlimited monopoly and revenue is slavery, that it is legal slavery, and that the payment of twenty shillings on the principle on which it is demanded, would make him a slave."* This spirit was the soul of the American revolution. The maxims adopted from the above and kindred writers, and published in popular writings, and proclaimed in every gathering of the people, by such men as Franklin, Paine, and Jefferson, and now become household words, were such as these, "that governments rest on the consent of the governed, and any other government is tyrannical; that resistance to oppression is obedience to God; that there should be a strong people and a weak government; that every nation, when aggrieved, that is able and agreed, has a right to set up over themselves any form of government which to them may appear most con-

* See quoted in "The Pulpit of the American Revolution," Boston, 1860, p. 112.

ducive to their common welfare." The term "nation" was employed to denote Massachusetts and the colonies severally, in their as yet disunited and unfederated capacity.* Thus, in 1774, "the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, in a message sent by John Hancock to General Gage, declares, 'that the sole end of government is protection and security of the people.' Whenever, therefore, that power, which was originally instituted to effect these important and valuable purposes, is employed to harass, distress, or enslave the people, in this case it becomes a curse, and not a blessing." And he adds, at the very time that domestic slavery, under a very rigid code, existed in that "nation," and when the clergyman and his wife walked to church with a negro man and woman on either side of them, "*the little negroes being distributed, according to their size, on either side of their respective parents,*"* "we are not afraid of poverty, but we disdain slavery."

So universally had these principles become inwrought into the public mind, that, in the eloquent language of Dr. Styles, "the soul of the American continent was poured out in the Declaration of Independence," by which the colonies proclaimed to the world that they, severally, "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." † The Declaration, in which Mr. Lincoln professed to believe, as both his law and gospel, proceeds to embody substantially the principles already mentioned—declares that all government has its foundation in the consent of the governed, and repeats the very words used by John Hancock.

---

* See Pulpit, p. 240.

† See Pulpit, ¶ xxxv, and pp. 193, 194, 195.

No terms could more perfectly declare the sovereignty of each of the States severally, than this Declaration, considered as the embodiment of preëxisting and proclaimed principles. The rights of absolute sovereignties, with power both to make and unmake a government, are attributed not to any Union or Confederation, but to "free and independent States."

Let it be remembered, that the States have been established at different times, and by separate charters.

They continued to exist in this separate and independent form, for a period greater than they have coexisted in union. When Great Britain began to treat them as dependents, and parts of a consolidated empire, they separately protested, and when she proceeded to employ force to compel obedience, they also separately resorted to arms.

They also organized for themselves independent governments, and in every respect acted as sovereign commonwealths.

Under these governments the war of the Revolution was carried on, and every act of sovereignty performed.

In vindication of their war, they appealed to "their natural and constitutional rights, in opposition to the machinations of wicked men, aiming to enslave and ruin the whole nation."*

It was only when all were endangered, that, in 1777, these sovereign States entered into the Articles of Confederation, calling themselves, not a "nation," but "the United States," and affirming, in Article II., "Each State retains its SOVEREIGNTY, freedom, and independence, and every POWER, jurisdiction, and right, not expressly delegated," etc.

In this constitutional compact, it was provided that the Union shall be PERPETUAL, and that no alteration should hereafter be made in it, unless first agreed to by Congress, *and afterwards confirmed by the Legislature* OF EVERY STATE."

---

* See Pulpit, pp. 235, 237.

Was the constitution of the subsequent Union an alteration of this constitution, so as to secure "a more perfect union," or was it a new compact altogether? In either case, it was the work of a SECESSION of States, in the exercise of their sovereignty. If, therefore, the Union was justifiable, then secession is a fundamental American doctrine, and the Confederate States are based upon the same foundation of authenticated right as the Union was. And if secession is rebellion now, then it was so in 1786, and the whole country is bound by the "PERPETUAL" compact of 1777. The facts are these: In 1786, a "Convention," called by the State of Virginia, which represented only *five* out of thirteen States, met to propose amendments, which, *when unanimously ratified by every State*, might be adopted by the Congress of the whole. But what was the actual result? Against the wishes of many of the States, and without any ratification of it by them, or in the way the Constitution required, a new constitutional compact was formed, with no allusion to that one, still binding and "PERPETUAL." It even goes so far as to declare, in Article VII., that this new compact shall go into operation when any nine (instead of all, as required) States shall ratify it. This was as many as Mr. Madison thought could be induced to adopt it. And thus *the present United States was framed upon a perfect theory of* SECESSION.

But the fathers and founders of the Union not only recognized and acted upon the doctrine of SECESSION from a PERPETUAL UNION, by as many States as would agree to secede, against the Constitution and the wishes of the remaining States; they also based the doctrine of SECESSION upon the doctrine of the indisputable SOVEREIGNTY of the States. In *form*, the Constitution says, "We, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish." The form, however, had no power or life until that was infused by the ratification of the States respectively. It was the action of free, sovereign, and independent States, and this alone, that ordained and established the Union. It is a union of States,

and not of the people. Its Senate, therefore, which participates in the executive government, represents the legislatures of the States, and not the people.

The doctrines of secession, and of the sovereignty of States, are, therefore, fundamental American doctrines, for they constitute the very foundation on which the Union rested. In coming into it, all the States tacitly, and Virginia, New York, and Rhode Island, as representatives of the Southern, Middle, and Eastern States, embodied these doctrines in the very act by which they ratified the Union, so that you can not prove that they—any of them—ever entered the Union without establishing the doctrines of State sovereignty and secession. "The powers of government," says New York, in her ratifying act, "may be re-assumed by the people, whensoever it shall become necessary to their happiness; and EVERY power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not CLEARLY delegated to the Congress of the United States, remains to the people of the SEVERAL STATES."

As early as 1798, while the Constitution was yet in its infancy, Virginia and Kentucky spoke unmistakably of the limited powers of our general government. Mr. Madison was the author of the Virginia, and Mr. Jefferson of the Kentucky resolutions. The third of the Virginia resolutions is, "That this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it views the powers of the Federal Government, as resulting from a compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no further valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto have the right, and are in duty bound to interpose, for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them."

The doctrines of State sovereignty and secession, against which the North is now compelling the South to wage a defensive war, are, therefore, fundamental to the American mind, and to the history of its governments, in each State separately, and in all combined, and through every change.

In 1811, Josiah Quincy boldly and emphatically affirmed both of these doctrines, on the floor of Congress, declaring that if the people of Orleans Territory were allowed to form a constitution, "the Union, or bonds of the Union, are virtually dissolved; that the States that compose it are free from their moral obligations; and as it will be the *right*, so it will be the *duty*, of SOME, to prepare definitely for a separation, *amicably if they can, violently if they must.*" Being called to order, and declared out of order by the Speaker, Mr. Quincy was sustained in an appeal to the House. And so universally popular were these doctrines then, that they elevated Mr. Jefferson to the Presidential chair.

Let it also be well considered, that while these doctrines were tacitly and generally admitted and acted upon, and the school of strict construction prevailed pure and uncontaminated, which was for a period of some forty or fifty years, the country enjoyed uninterrupted union and domestic tranquillity, in an eminent degree. They led to mutual forbearance and compromise then, and afterwards, in 1814, saved the country from civil war. Feeling sectionally aggrieved in her commercial interests by the last war with Great Britain, Massachusetts, who regarded it as "not becoming a moral and religious people," declared the united Constitution a failure, called for a convention, and recommended to officer ten thousand men, and provide one million dollars for their support. In this she was seconded by Connecticut and Rhode Island. The Hartford Convention declared the Constitution of the United States to be "incurably and intrinsically defective," and the administration "a military despotism." It declared that dissolution of the Union was preferable to radical and permanent abuses, and

that it should, if possible, "be the work of peaceable times and deliberate consent." They appointed another convention to await the action of Congress, and, in the mean time urge upon every State "effectually to protect their own sovereignty, and the rights and liberties of their citizens." Thus, according to New England, endangered State sovereignty and economic prosperity make secession an imperative duty, peaceably if possible, but by force if necessary.

It is most manifest, from this review of facts, that the United States compact was the result, and itself an act, of secession, based upon State sovereignty, and that it provided for secession at any future time. *It omitted all reference to any clause of perpetuity.* The plan of a strong central government, offered by Mr. Hamilton, was utterly rejected. Any attempt to coerce States into the Union, or, when in it, to a compulsory obedience, was, after full discussion, also repelled, as in its very nature suicidal, and involving, as Jefferson styles it, "the violent death of the Union." The introduction of sectional jealousies and divisions was prefigured by Washington, as the sure precursor of disunion. The Missouri Compromise, forced upon the South by the North, only to be immediately and constantly resisted and perverted, rung the death-knell of the Union. The sage of Quincy long ago foretold, and by his teachings prepared the way for disunion. Seward boasts of having long foreseen this as the result of his "irrepressible conflict;" and the sure beginning of the sad end was formally laid down in the platform of the Republican party, on whose basis the present Abolition administration was clothed with power to rend the Union, and to involve in one common ruin the happiness of both North and South.

The war of the South is, therefore, in vindication of the doctrines of State sovereignty and of peaceable secession, which has always constituted the predominant idea of the American mind. Hamilton* foresaw that "the first war of

* Federalist, p. 172.

coercion would probably terminate in a dissolution of the Union." John Quincy Adams taught, that every State had the same right to secede from the Union that, as a colony, it had to separate from Great Britain, and that disunion was much better than alienation. Webster declared, in October, 1832, that "the President had no authority to blockade Charleston;" the President had no authority to employ military force, "till he shall be required to do so by law." Mr. Rawle lays down the constitutionality of secession, and teaches that such secession leaves the Union intact; since the life of the Union does not, as Dr. Hodge gratuitously affirms, depend on the number of States, but on the union of any number. The Hon. J. K. Paulding said, in 1851, that "the first attempt to coerce any one State will be the handwriting on the wall, predicting the speedy and certain fate of the Union."

In standing, therefore, upon the fundamental doctrines of State sovereignty, and the right of secession, the South has built her house upon the primitive rock of American liberty, which can not be overthrown, nor questioned, without giving the lie to themselves, by either the Northern or New England States.

The only point necessary to make this argument conclusive is, the prior and paramount authority of each State over the citizens of said State, and the prior and paramount obedience due by every citizen to the State. Just as in a family, or city, the authority over their members is immediate, and paramount to that of the State, or country, in all that is within their sphere of jurisdiction, so it is with the State in relation to the United or Confederate States. Such paramount authority was exercised by each State over its citizens, long anterior to any confederation with other States. It was only through the exercise of this power, any State became united in any compact with any other, so that a portion of the allegiance due to it was by it transferred to other States, under definite limitations, constitu-

tionally defined. But if each State had power to transfer and limit the allegiance due by its citizens to the States united, it still retains power to recall that allegiance, and to concentrate it again upon itself, or transfer it to some other confederacy. The primary and paramount allegiance of every citizen of any Confederate State is now, therefore, as always, due to that State, and so far as the Constitution ratified by it has provided, is now transferred from the United States to the Confederate States. The State alone, however, has absolute possession of the person, life, and property of her citizens, except in cases of treason, and crimes against clearly intrusted Federal powers; and she alone defends these inestimable rights of her citizens, levies taxes, etc. This power of each State is original, inherent, and sovereign. It never was delegated to it by a more general government, which is itself its creature.

But further: the United States in organizing their present government, not only did so upon the principle of the admitted sovereignty and independence of each of the States, *then* bound together by a constitutional compact declared to be permanent and unalterable by any State or States separately, and of the consequent right of any number of them, in order to secure more perfectly, as they believed, their peace, safety, and happiness, to *secede;* and, without leave asked or obtained, to adopt a constitution and organize a new and independent government—they have *never* yet been recognized by foreign nations except in their separate, free, sovereign and independent character as States.

Besides, in all that relates to the exercise of government as free, sovereign, and independent States, the united government has always recognized the inherent, unchanged, prerogative of every State in the Union, and has refused to interfere with them, even at the instance of Great Britain; as in the case of repudiated State debts, and the law of South Carolina respecting colored seamen.

"The letter of Mr. Webster to Baring Brothers & Co., in 1839, and which may be considered an exposition addressed to European nations, is a more recent explanation of the relations of these States to the common Government. The opinions of that distinguished man will be scarcely considered as affected with prejudices in favor of the slaveholding States 'Every State (said he) is an independent, sovereign political community, except in so far as certain powers, which it might otherwise have exercised, have been conferred on a General Government, established under a written Constitution, and exercising its authority over the people of all the States. *Its General Government is a limited Government.* Its powers are specific and enumerated. *All powers not conferred on it still remain with the States or with the people. The State Legislatures, on the other hand, possess all usual and ordinary powers of Government,* subject to any limitations which may be imposed by their own Constitutions, and with the exception, as I have said, of the operations on those powers of the Constitution of the United States.' The circumstances which called forth this letter, and the character of the persons to whom it was addressed, give to it much more significance than otherwise would be attached to the opinions of an individual, however distinguished.

"This view of the relations between the States and the General Government came to be practicably understood in a very striking manner, by the law of the State of South Carolina, establishing the regulations which must be observed in the case of colored seamen arriving in any of its ports. This matter has been particularly offensive to Great Britain, it would seem, from the pertinacious opposition made to it some time since by a former representative of the British Government. The authority of the Government of the United States was invoked to remove the objectionable law. The consequence which the remonstrance to the Government of the United States was intended to develop, was a conflict between the treaty-making power of the Government and the sovereign authority of the State. The conflict, if established, it was supposed, would conclude the question. And it was so. But it did not conclude it in the manner supposed. For the sovereign power of the State was paramount to the treaty-making power, if there could arise an actual conflict between them. A proper conflict, however, could not arise between them; for the fact that the operation of a treaty would affect the sovereignty of a State, was in itself the conclusive evidence that the power to make treaties had been abused, by involving in its operation that which it could not reach."*

---

* See the exceedingly lucid and able papers of Juridicus, (the Hon. A. G. Magrath,) on "The International Doctrine of Recognition," in "The Charleston Courier" of February — and —, 1863, and published, therefore, since this article was in press.

The States of this Southern Confederacy having, therefore, united in a common government, against which the United States have feloniously, wickedly, and without cause, and against every principle fundamental to American liberty and constitutional right, waged war, it is made the primary and paramount duty of every citizen to come up to the help of his State and country, in maintaining their freedom, sovereignty, and independence.

III. THE WAR OF THE SOUTH IS JUSTIFIED AS A DEFENSIVE WAR AGAINST FANATICAL ABOLITION.

The war now carried on by the North is a war against slavery, and is, therefore, treasonable rebellion against the Constitution of the United States, and against the word, providence, and government of God.

It might be shown that slavery is not in itself wrong, any more than monarchy, aristocracy, or autocracy; and that, as a form of organized involuntary labor, it has always and every where existed among the negro race, and has been found to conduce, under proper moral and religious direction, to the best interests of that race, and of the world at large; and, therefore, can afford no warrantable pretext for waging war against these Southern States. But it is enough to know that, let slavery in the South be right or wrong, and injurious or not, to the United States, that it existed, as a common institution, in every colony and State before and during the Revolutionary war; that it was considered as perfectly consistent with the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation; that the United States Constitution was a compromise, by which the agriculture of the South, with its slave labor, and the commerce of the North, with its free labor, should be equally provided for and protected; that but for this guarantee, embodied in several provisions of the Constitution, the United States never would have included a single Southern State; that for an allotted term of years, fixed by the North, it

carried on a home and foreign slave trade, and supplied the South with all its present slaves, from its own bleak and unprofitable climate and from Africa; that the unexampled prosperity and growth of the United States, have been in exact accordance with the development of the slave population, the slave territory, and the slave products, cotton, rice, tobacco, sugar, and naval stores, of the South; and that the South never sought any thing under the Union, beyond that equality and community of rights, privileges, and immunities, with which she entered it, and only to enjoy which she ever did enter it. The North, therefore, had no right, any more than a dishonest partner, thief, or highway robber, to interfere with the institution of slavery, in its progressive development in the States and territories, so long as the compact of union remained unchanged. And if it was led to believe that the coexistence of the two forms of organized involuntary service, (for *all* hard labor, free or slave, is a part of the original curse, and only performed from necessity,) could not longer profitably and pleasantly continue, then she was bound, by every principle of honor, of justice, of truth, of common honesty, to propose a dissolution of partnership. And when the South, as the weaker party, did propose it, and ask for a peaceful adjustment of all claims arising under it, it was dishonorable and disgraceful in the North, like a monstrous bully, to make might right, and in order to have no rival, and no participant in the glories of American liberty, to wage a war of subjugation and the extermination of slavery. The meanness, perfidy, hypocrisy, and diabolical heartlessness of a war for such an end, is without parallel in the history of the world's worst despotisms.

The North first entrapped the South into the Union, under false pretences and hypocritical promises; she then aggrandized herself, and developed her wonderful prosperity, by selling to the South slaves, and then selling the products of their labor; and now, in a spirit of selfish,

fanatical ambition, she urges war to exterminate slavery, and destroy the South.

But the argument is lifted up to a far higher platform, when we consider slavery in relation to the word, providence, and government of God. That God's providence is holy, wise, and powerful; that it extendeth to all things and all events; our enemies themselves profess to believe, even in their catechisms. Slavery, therefore, whether as a form of temporal, political, organized society, it is good or evil, is, like other similar forms of evil, providential; and as such, is under God's holy, wise, and powerful government, and to be acted upon only in accordance with the principles of His word and gospel, that by them God may, as it pleaseth Him, continue, remove, ameliorate, or modify it, as it seemeth to Him wise and good. And to wage a war of extermination against slavery—a war in itself wicked and unconstitutional, and carried on in a spirit of diabolical perfidy and inhumanity—is to fight against God, and to rush against the thick bosses of the Almighty. It is rebellion against the Lord God omnipotent, who ruleth. To participate in it, is to join in conspiracy against the throne and empire of heaven. And did not the South come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, she would involve herself in the divine malediction with which the inhabitants of Meroz were cursed.

But what if God made slavery a part of man's and woman's original curse; what if God ordained, as a part of that penalty, that the earth should be brought into universal cultivation by a universally diffused race, through slavery in some form of involuntary servitude; what if God, by a positive, divine enactment, ordained that through the history of the world, slavery should exist as a form of organized labor among certain races of men, and that lordship over such slaves should be a part of the perpetual blessing of the races of Shem and Japheth; what if God has actually embodied slavery in His moral law, and by

INPERFECT IN ORIGINAL

there guarding, and protecting, and regulating it, has made it appertain to the present condition of humanity; what if He ordained and regulated it under the patriarchal, Mosaical, prophetical, and Christian dispensations; what if in the New Testament a curse is pronounced against fanatical opposition to slavery as anti-Christian, and a sentence of withdrawal from such as heretical, both in Church and State; what if, in these and other ways, God claims slavery, like other forms of government adapted to sinful human nature, as His own ordinance for good; what, then, must be thought of this war of the North against slavery, and this war of the South in its defence, as inwoven by providence into the very texture of its body politic?

This war is a judgment upon the North, for its persistent, perjured, Abolition fanaticism. Nearly severing the Union in 1790, it rung its death-knell in 1820, and has since then inflamed an irrepressible conflict, which has now destroyed the Union, and is overwhelming the North in inextricable difficulties.

God is working out a problem in the physical, social, political, industrial, and world-wide beneficial character of slavery, as a great missionary agency, of unexampled prosperity and success, which He is now demonstrating to the family of nations.

In this war the South, therefore, is on God's side. She has His word, and providence, and omnipotent government with her. And if she is found faithful to Him, and to this institution, which He has put under her spiritual care, then the heavens and earth may pass away, but God will not fail to vindicate His eternal providence, and defend and deliver His people, who walk in His statutes and commandments blameless.*

---

* Already has that vindication come from the most powerful organs of European, and even Northern opinion. We will give an extract from one out of many:

"There is no form of mendacity," says the London Dispatch, of Oct. 21, 1862, "more pernicious in its consequences, or more insidious in its tempta-

IV. THE DIVINE RIGHT OF SECESSION.

We proceed to vindicate the war of the South by an appeal to God's word. To the law and testimony God has

---

tions, than that which imposes pious frauds on society. The sanctification of means, by consideration of their ends, is a vice inherent in religious people; and no offenders have been more shameless in this regard than the Abolitionists of America and the anti-slavery ('Clapham Sect,') persuasion in England. Their lecturers, their travellers, their talkers and tourists, their historians and novelists, have seen in slave countries, and as the effect of slavery, phenomena which the slightest reflection would contradict and belie. Every man at all well read—any one, indeed, who can but read his Bible—knows that slavery has been the normal condition of human society, and that it has been found compatible with, to have been even promotive of, power, wealth, civilization, nay, even humanity. The Scriptural nations, the very patriarchs, all were slaveholders. Sparta, in the glory of its purity and virtue; Athens, in the zenith of its glory in arts, arms and literature, had a vast majority of their subjects 'held to labor.' The Jewish law of Moses is full of provisions for the making, transfer, and manumission of slaves. The Tenth Commandment tells us not to covet our neighbor's man-servant, or his maid-servant, in the very same category as his ox and his ass. Rome conquered the world, and civilized it, under a dispensation of slavery. The West India Colonies flourished while slavery prevailed. They went to ruin, both of white man and black, the day they were emancipated. All the experiments that have been tried of the self-elevation of the colored races, or, indeed, of even white races of aboriginal savages, by manumission or colonization, have been conspicuous failures. King Lincoln calls the negroes together to tell them that their contiguity is odorous to his subjects, and that they must clear out for Central America. He assured Horace Greeley that if the Union can be saved by riveting the chains of the slave, he will rivet them.

"As for the slaves themselves, crushed with the wrongs of Dred Scot and Uncle Tom—most provoking—they can not be brought to 'burn with revenge.' They are spies for their masters. They obstinately refuse to run away to liberty, outrage, and starvation. They work in the fields as usual, when the planter and the overseer are away, and only the white women are left at home. The black regiments of insurgent Unionists have proved a failure and been disbanded. We wonder how 'Professor' (!) Olmstead and Horace Greeley look now that their tours through the slave States are compared with facts, and laid alongside with the despatches and the telegrams of the belligerents. Stowe, Wendell Phillips, Garrison, insured us a servile war the moment an army of liberation was marched into the South; but the soda-powder won't fizz; the lucifer match has been

bound himself by His word, and by this word we shall be judged, and our cause tested. To this standard our enemies

---

rubbed, but obstinately refuses to flare up. We were assured the Southerners were indolent, and their soil stricken with hopeless and growing poverty. They have sustained for nearly two years the shocks of a war to which those of Napoleon were skirmishes, rolled back the tide of battle, and are now thundering at the very gates of a quaking enemy, that have brought thirteen hundred thousand warriors into the field, and equipped, paid, fed, and furnished them, as never army and navy were sustained before. We were told that the Southerners were sunk in listless luxury and self-indulgent sensuality; that they were depraved by self-will and licentiousness below the capacity for administrative government. What are the facts? Never, we assert with the utmost confidence, was there known a people so able in public affairs, so heroic, so brave, so prudent, so devoted. Whatever may be the issue of this war, planters and slave-owners have raised up by their deeds an imperishable monument of their greatness and magnanimity.

"In little more than a month they extemporized and matured a Government, a Constitution, a Legislature, social authority, that have stood the test of the most critical experiment with triumphant success, and are more workable, consistent, stable, and free than the institutions they disowned. The border slave States have left them to their fate; have armed against them. Twenty millions of Unionists have attacked six millions of 'rebels,' and the free States men have been beaten back to their very trenches by less than one-third of their number of slave-drivers. The latter had no navy, and had to fight in every river and struggle in every town against a powerful fleet. They had not the nucleus of a regiment, a company, a squadron, scarcely a piece of artillery. They had to raise regiments without any great centres of population—they had no powder-mills, no foundries, no paper for cartridges, leather for shoes and harness, clothing—industry and production were paralyzed, and their intercourse with the world shut out by blockade. They had to destroy their produce, abandon their cities to the invaders, and their villages to the flames—they were menaced with, and had to provide for, the contingency of a servile war—they have been left without the countenance of Europe, and opposed by the border planters; yet behold the result of slavery, as against equality and fraternity. It is quite evident that the resources of the South must be prodigious—that the state of society must at least be up to the standard of the greatest and most enlightened nations—that the culture of the people must be severe, self-denying, and refined—to produce such fruits as these.

"These proofs of wealth, strength, intelligence, and virtue, are more than borne out by the decennial census made by the Federal Government itself, when no disturbing causes threw suspicion upon the returns. In 1850, the

have brought us, and condemned us; and multitudes who once admitted the justice of the course pursued by the South, up to the very act of secession and resistance, have found in these an unpardonable sin, according to the divine record, and have become our most implacable enemies, and the most earnest instigators of war in all possible ferocity, until it leads either to subjugation or extermination. The relation of Christianity to civil government, and of Christian liberty to political freedom, was one of the first practical doctrines on which authoritative divine teaching was required. The apostles, and especially Paul and Peter, develop, therefore, the general teaching of Christ in full and frequent directions, teaching us that civil government is ordained by God for man's present life and temporal concerns, and is entirely distinct in its sphere from that included within His spiritual kingdom. Christianity, therefore, requires as implicit and conscientious obedience to civil government as to ecclesiastical authority, and has made civil governors a terror to evil doers, and His appointed revengers, to execute wrath upon the disobedient.

From these admitted premises, divines at the North, of every denomination, with amazing unanimity, have drawn

---

breadstuffs of the free States were given at 334,000,000 of bushels, and of the 'rebels' at 383,000,000; potatoes in the North 60,000,000 bushels, and in the South 44,000,000; milch cows, 4,000,000 and 2,800,000, respectively; sheep, 15,000,000 in the North against 6,600,000 in the South; swine, 10,000,000 in the North and 20,000,000 in the South; Northern bullocks, 4,200,000 and Southern 6,085,800. This proportionate produce is 18½ bushels breadstuffs per head in the free, and 32 bushels in the slave States; of potatoes, 3½ bushels each; of rice, 18 pounds in the South, and none at all in the North; of sugar, 20½ pounds in the South, and *nil* in the North. Besides all this, the South exports £45,000,000 sterling in cotton and tobacco, for which the North has no equivalent. In a word, without the South, the Republic will fall to the state of Russia, for its resources are really not greater, and the charity of Europe in emigration alone raises it above the Muscovite level. Let but the South go on fighting, *pro aris et focis*, until its armies become as seasoned and thoroughly military as the cohorts of Cæsar, Napoleon, or Wellington, and they will need but a secession."

the conclusion that the secession and defensive war of the South is rebellion and treason against God's ordained government, and are, therefore, to be "crushed out" with all the weight of unmitigated and pitiless destruction. The cool ferocity or raging vengeance with which this interpretation of God's word has envenomed the hearts of the most humble and venerable Christians at the North, is perfectly appalling. Not Saul, in his career of murderous persecution, nor the disciples, when they would call down fire from heaven to destroy, were more inflamed with pitiless malevolence, by the infatuated thought of doing God service, than are modern successors to their misguided zeal. Earthly suffering to the uttermost is not enough. Swift destruction does not slake their fiery vengeance. It is not enough, like Dr. Stanton, to gloat their eager thirst for our misery; to anticipate, in fiendish joy, the hanging of their *Christian brethren*, and the helotry of our wives, mothers, and sisters; pandemonium must be prepared; purgatorial fires must be made a reality, and hell's fiercest flames must everlastingly torment us.

In this argument the South has not even the benefit of a doubt, or the privilege of a hearing; but, sitting in God's temple, they deliver to us God's will, and wield God's thunderbolts against those whom they consider too weak and helpless to resist their overwhelming might.

> "Oh! blest is he to whom 'tis given,
> The instinct that can tell
> That God is in the field,
> Where most invisible.
> And blest is he who can divine
> Where real might doth lie,
> And dares to take the side that seems
> Wrong to man's blindfold eye."

This inferential argument of our Northern enemies, is as weak as it is wicked. It is a huge, monstrous sophism, as baseless as it is brutal, and as futile as it is fiendish. It takes for granted that civil government is, in any natural

order of events, the ordinance of God by a direct institution, which it assuredly is not. It assumes that the government of the United States was thus ordained, while it declares itself to be the product of "we, the people." It assumes that, while originated by the people, as a protection of the minority against the power of an irresponsible majority, that minority has no right to interpret what this Constitution is, or to contend for the rights it was made to guarantee, preserve, and perpetuate. It assumes that a constitution, which was framed by a convention representing only five States, and representing only the legislatures, and not the people of those States; which was made while those States were constitutionally bound to eight other States in a federal government, which they had solemnly declared was perpetual, and unalterable except by a congressional amendment, ratified by every State; that this constitution, thus unconstitutionally made and adopted, and urged to acceptance, and which was not declared to be perpetual; from which all power to coerce obedience, or centralize a "strong government," was peremptorily excluded; and to withdraw from which *every* State *tacitly*, and three, in the name of all, *explicitly*, claimed, in ratifying it, the right; that this Constitution shall be perpetually binding, even when perverted to oppression and injustice, and shall for ever destroy that State sovereignty and right of framing a new government, which were guaranteed in the Federal Union of 1777, and acted upon by the five States that organized the Union of 1789. This inferential argument assumes that the accidental success of a minority of the people, in putting into temporary power the Lincoln administration, under pledges of an unconstitutional policy, destructive of fifteen States, is the Constitution and Government of the United States, and the positive ordinance of God, to which, under peril of damnation, implicit obedience is in all things due. It assumes that, while thirteen Northern States, by legislative action, passed

laws in open conflict with constitutional guarantees, and fostered and encouraged within them seditious and treasonable parties, and measures against the peace and rights of fifteen States; that the violated Constitution still binds to continued and increasing insult and infamy these injured States, although Daniel Webster declared that in such circumstances "the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact. A bargain broken on one side is a bargain broken on all sides."

Such are some of the monstrous falsities assumed as true, in the inferential argument which justifies Dr. Stanton, as the mouth-piece of multitudes, in the atrocious language attributed to him. If this argument is correct, then any resistance, negatively or positively, to the advancing military despotism of Lincoln, deserves hanging on earth, and damnation in hell; then every principle of American liberty is a delusion of Satan, and a damnable lie, originated by the father of lies; then every form of "the powers that be" is by divine right, and the grace of God, immutable and absolute; then Milton, and Sidney, and the signers of our Declaration of Independence, and our patriot fathers, and ministers of the Gospel, were all arch-traitors and heretics, and deserving only the gibbet or the stake; then the slavery of Dahomey, and the blind despotism of the Turk, are "the ordinance of God;" and what are we to think of themselves, who have decreed the emancipation of four millions of people from "the powers that be," and which by this argument are made the "ordinance of God," which he that resisteth bringeth to himself damnation!

And still further. The Southern Confederacy is now, by permission of divine providence, one of "the powers that be," and is, therefore, the "ordinance of God;" and this war is, therefore, a damnable resistance of God's ordinance. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself!"

In the name, therefore, of eternal justice, sacred truth, and divine charity, we protest against an inferential argument from Scripture, which delivers over millions of people to temporal and everlasting destruction; which converts the best of Christians into the worst of persecutors, and transforms even the love of Christ, our common Saviour, into the heartless malice of His crucifiers.

The teaching of Scripture is, that civil government is ordained by God, in accordance with the nature of man and of society, and of man's present sinful and selfish character; that He ordained it, not directly, nor in any particular form, but through the instrumentality of man; that its end is the security and happiness of the good, and as a terror to the evil; that He ordains, also, that in this agency His people shall be free, and "use their liberty" under the guidance of His word and providence; that when a government is thus "the ordinance of men," and so long as it is faithfully and purely administered, He approves of it, and blesses it, and requires a faithful and conscientious discharge of all the relative duties of good citizenship, according to the provisions, privileges, and obligations of the constitution. Government is designed by God as much for those that rule as for those under their rule. It is designed as certainly to restrain usurpation of unconstitutional powers, as insubordination to that which is constitutional. There is as certainly sin, and guilt, and treason against God and man, in the arbitrary exercise of unconstitutional authority, as in rebellion against that which is just. Both are alike rebellion against the ordinance of God and of man, the constitution, which is the supreme ruler over all, the source and limit of all power, and of all obedience. And when, therefore, in the good providence of God, a people have been prepared and permitted to "use their liberty," "as free," in framing a constitutional government, to be exercised over them with their own consent, they also are made the conservers of that constitution, and it

becomes their duty to see it maintained, and all their rights under it preserved. And whenever, in the judgment of that people, such government is perverted, and their rights withheld, it becomes their duty to secure its restoration to original purity, or to withdraw from it, and to set up another for themselves. This course is not only proper, but a high and holy patriotic duty they owe to themselves, their families, and their posterity after them. To act otherwise is a base betrayal of the trust imposed upon them, and of the "free liberty" with which Providence has honorably endowed them, and a guilty connivance at corruption and tyranny. It is, Esau-like, to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, and to enslave themselves and their children to a government which is no longer their ordinance, or the ordinance of God, but a wicked corruption of both.

This doctrine of civil government is embodied by the apostle Paul, in his dogmatic teaching in Romans, thirteenth chapter, and it is explicitly taught by the apostle Peter, 1 Peter, 2 : 13, *et seq.*:

"Submit yourselves," says the apostle, "to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honor all men."

Civil governors, whether kingly or republican, are, as the apostle teaches, "the ordinance of men," who are "free" men, and "all to be honored," and only responsible for the exercise of their "liberty" to God, "as the servants of God," and under obligation to Him not to "use their liberty as a cloak of maliciousness," that "with well-doing they may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. "This," says the apostle, "is the will of God," who, in

this way, "ordains governors," who, while chosen and appointed by men, "are sent by him;" and hence, when a government ceases to be "for good," and promotive of happiness, then it becomes a tyrannous usurpation, and secession from it, or a revolution under it, becomes a divinely imposed duty.

"Obedience is due to any government," says Dr. Hodge, (on Romans, 13,) "only within the sphere of legitimate authority," "in the exercise of its lawful authority;" that is, only so far as may be determined by the Constitution and the rights, in this country, of "free, sovereign, and independent States," by whom all constitutional limits were prescribed. The sphere of legitimate authority was assigned to the United States Government, not by the people, but by the States, each for itself, in sovereign convention; and no accidental majority of electoral votes, against a majority of nearly a million of voters, out of four millions, in the Northern States, and the concentrated opposition of fifteen States, could make it lawful authority in the Lincoln administration to transcend all limits of constitutional authority, and assume absolute and despotic power.

The inferential argument of the present vindictive and persecuting clergy of the North, is precisely that of the Romish Church and the dark ages—the divine right of absolute government, and of implicit passive obedience. It is that doctrine which was preached from the pulpit and the press by tory divines, at the time of the Revolution, who anathematized our fathers as "rebels," guilty of damnable sin, and against which the divines who favored liberty, and "resistance to tyrants as obedience to God," openly protested as heretical, anti-Christian, and slavish. In proof of this our readers are referred to the work already referred to, "The Pulpit of the American Revolution," published in Boston, in 1860:

The first discourse is an elaborate discussion of the *present* Northern doctrine of "unlimited submission and non-resistance to the higher powers," by Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, preached in 1749, and published in 1750, from the very passages quoted by our enemies. He speaks of it as a known and admitted truth, that "rulers are not the ordinance and ministers of God, *but only so far forth as they perform God's will by acting up to their* office and character." Only "*good rulers*" are to be obeyed. (669.) "Rulers have no authority from God to do mischief." (p. 73.) "Such are not God's ministers, but the devil's." (p. 75.) "*Open and avowed resistance by arms, against usurpation and lawless violence, is not rebellion*, by the law of God or the land." (Do., note.) "The argument here used (by the apostles) no more proves it to be a sin to resist such rulers than to resist the devil." (p. 77.) "*Not to discontinue our allegiance* in this case would be to join in promoting the slavery and misery of society." (p. 79.) He thus proves that it would be criminally sinful in any people not to resist, passively if they must, but openly and by force if they can, unconstitutional usurpation! And this is the doctrine of the whole volume.

Did time permit, we are prepared to show that the interpretation we have given is in most perfect and literal accordance with the Declaration of Independence, and therefore with the principles which led our revolutionary fathers to resist the usurpation of unconstitutional power by the government *under which they lived, and to which they had rendered, and still acknowledged, all rightful obedience.*

It was upon this interpretation and received doctrine of God's word, the original colonies entered into a compact to carry out their resistance to unconstitutional and usurped authority. They became a confederacy, and framed a constitutional form of government for themselves, each State retaining its sovereignty, and yet the Union to be perpetual so long, and so far, as it accomplished its intended purposes.

This interpretation and belief of God's teaching and their right, privilege, and duty to secure for themselves, in the best manner possible, the divinely ordained end for which all government is instituted—that is, good order, security of person and property, justice, and equal and impartial rights—led the States, a few years afterwards, to modify their union, and again afterwards to amend it. This was done by each State separately and independently, and at different times, and under solemn reservations and limited grant of power, and only after all that pertained to the common protection and exclusive State control of the system of slavery had been most clearly and inviolably guaranteed. This alone made any one Southern State unite even in a limited union with the North.

This interpretation and doctrine has governed the conduct of the United States Government and Congress since its foundation, hitherto, in their recognition of the independent nationality of States which, by revolution or rebellion, had thrown off their previous allegiance to a recognized government, as in South America, Italy, Hayti, Greece, France, etc.

This is known to have been the doctrine of most, if not all the founders, including Washington, and of the successive leaders of opinion of the United States Government.

The right of peaceable secession by a free people, in the just and proper exercise of their liberty, from any government, with a view to restore to themselves a more perfect administration of it, or to form another, is, therefore, a right given by God, and sanctioned by His holy word.

This right is inwoven with the fundamental facts of American history, from which alone, as Daniel Webster well says, "the true nature of the Government of the United States can be learned."

This doctrine has been the avowed faith of multitudes of our present enemies, and of many leading organs of public

opinion at the North, and is still promulgated by Horace Greeley, in the *Tribune*, which first raised the shout of war, and gave forth the banner of "beauty and booty," of blood, murder, rapine, and extermination.

"In yesterday's *Tribune*," that is of September 26, 1862, says *The New York Herald*, of the next day, "over his own proper signature, Horace Greeley published a letter, in which he declares in favor of the right of secession, not only in the case of the rebellious States of the South, but even of the Pacific States and Territories, should they desire to get up a new government for themselves. He lays down this general principle, applicable to every State in the Union: 'What I have taught and believed, and still maintain, is the right of a people to form and modify their political institutions without the necessity of fighting for such change.' He denies that a county, or two or three counties, can lawfully secede from a State. For example, the people of Nantucket could not be permitted to secede from Massachusetts, nor the people of Long Island or Staten Island, from the State of New York. But the case is different with a sovereign State, or even a colony which is not sovereign. For example, he says, 'I believe our revolutionary fathers had a right, for reasons which were cogent, and seemed to them conclusive, to terminate their connexion with Great Britain, and that the British were wrong in resisting their claim to do so. And the right which I claim for our fathers and for ourselves, I will not deny to others.'

"Then he goes on to say that, 'if the people of our Pacific States and Territories shall, at some future time, have very generally attained the conviction that they could do better as an independent nation than as a part of this country, and should kindly, frankly, firmly express that conviction,' he would say let the bonds be dissolved. And so likewise in the case of the Southern States. The following are his words:

"'This is the doctrine I tried to promulgate in the winter of 1860–'61, it seems, with ill success. But I still insist that it has been proved that if the people of the slave States, or even of the cotton States alone, had really desired to dissolve the Union, and had peacefully, deliberately, and authoritatively expressed that wish, we should have assented to it. At all events, I should. But they chose another method. The leaders assumed their right peacefully and summarily to dissolve the Union without the consent of their fellow-citizens, at least their close allies, their equal copartners of the free States.'

"It is said that an honest confession is good for the soul. Greeley has owned up at last. Many a time we charged him with promulgating these doctrines, and quoted extracts from his journal in vain. He either denied the soft impeachment, or was dumb. Now, after contributing in so vast a degree to break up the Union, he expects forgiveness for his treason, like the penitent thief on the cross; but his

repentance is not sincere. Let him, therefore, like Judas Iscariot, go and hang himself 'on a sour apple tree,' so as to save the people the trouble of doing it hereafter. *If the right of a State* peacefully to secede exists, the accident of war cannot alter the right; and if the cotton States had a right to secede, on the ground that they had 'very generally attained the conviction that they could do better as an independent nation than as a part of this country,' then we had no right to prevent their doing so by force, *and were the aggressors in making war upon them*, whereas, in taking up arms they were only defending a sacred right. Even in the case of seizing the forts and other property of the United States, they were only seizing a part of the common property, to which they had as good a right as the free States 'their equal co-partners.' If this was all that was the matter, the account could have been easily settled, and war would not have been necessary. In fact, the war, according to the reasoning of Greeley, is on our part the most atrocious ever waged against any people, and even more unjustifiable than that which Great Britain waged against these States when they were colonies under her sovereign sway, and threw off her yoke. There can be no doubt that the people of the States which have seceded are more unanimous than were the colonies at any time during the Revolutionary war."

THIS IS THE TRUTH, BEFORE GOD, by whom the guilt and misery of this war will be righteously adjudicated and avenged. The South adopted her course slowly, during forty years of patient forbearance, entreaty, and warning. Every step was taken prayerfully, and with anxious desire to be guided by divine wisdom, in sovereign convention of the people of our several States, after reiterated proposals for compromise or peaceable separation, by our members of Congress and the Convention of Virginia; and without the remotest design, or desire, or even serious expectation of war; with no spirit of retaliation or revenge, or injury to the North; but, contrariwise, of continued alliance, intercourse, and profitable relations. But all was vain. We were the sheep, and they the wolf, and we must be humbled, crushed, impoverished, and subdued. The cry of treason, rebellion, and murder, against the very life of the Union, must whet the teeth of blood-thirsty rapacity, and give sanction to a fierce and fanatical war of lawless violence.

But,

> "No claim hereditary—not the trust of frank election;
> Not even the high anointing hand of heaven;
> Can authorize oppression; give a law
> To lawless power; wed faith to violation;
> On reason build misrule; or, justly, bind
> Allegiance to injustice. Tyranny
> Absolves all faith; and who invades our rights,
> Howe'er his own commence, can never be
> But an usurper."

Resistance, or base subjection, is, therefore, the alternative of the South. She fights for no abstraction. That ordinance of our fathers which, by solemn compact, and a seven years' war, was ratified in heaven, as the ordinance of God, the South has rescued out of the hands of an unreal and sectional majority, who would erect upon it a Moloch despotism, and cause our children to pass through fire and blood; and has again enthroned it in its incorrupted purity in the hearts of eight millions of loving and loyal citizens; and for this—for this we are contending unto blood. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the right to be free, and call no mobocratic sectional majority master; the right to govern ourselves; the right to enjoy the peculiar privileges and blessings, as well as to endure the peculiar trials of our climate and institutions; the right to sit under our own vine and fig-tree, none daring to make us afraid, and gratefully to acknowledge that we have a goodly heritage; the right to believe the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as God's own and only infallible and unalterable truth; the right to search and interpret those Scriptures for ourselves, and to hold fast their truth against all gainsayers; liberty of thought, of speech, of life, of worship, of family, social and municipal government, free from all doctrines and commandments of men, and high and lifted up above any higher law; the right to free trade, free imports, and free exports, and free expanding progress,

prosperity, and glory; these are the rights for which we are contending.

The truth of God; the rights of man; the peace of the present, and prosperous harmony of all future generations; the purity of religion; the piety of our homes; the sanctity of our dwellings; the undefiled purity and honor of our wives and daughters; unpillaged property; unravaged fields; uninjured harvests; uncontaminated servants; all—every thing that is sacred to honor and to happiness, temporal and eternal—all are involved in this contest.

Neither can they be secured to us without war, and war to the bitter end. Those inestimable blessings, the inheritance of blood-bought victories, must be again secured by contending for them in the high places of the field—contending until the last man falls, and the last drop of blood is spilt. Death is infinitely preferable to the loss of these blessings—to defeat, disgrace, and degradation. He who would choose life at such a sacrifice, is not worthy of life, or fit to die.

Fight, then, we must, come life or death—

> "'Tis come, the hour of martyrdom
> In freedom's cause is come;
> And though blest lives shall pass away,
> Like lightning on a stormy day,
> Yet shall their death-hour leave a track
> Of glory, permanent and bright,
> To which the brave of after times—
> The suffering brave—shall long look back
> With proud regret, and by its light
> Watch, through the hours of suffering's night,
> For vengeance on the oppressor's chain."

Let the spirit of resistance be infused, with its mother's milk, into the baby in its cradle. Let it mingle with the plays of childhood. Let it animate the boy in his mimic manhood; the maiden in the exercise of her magic, spell-binding influence; the betrothed in her soul-subduing trance of hope and memory; the bride at the altar; the wife

in the arms of her rejoicing husband; the young mother amid her whirl of ecstatic joy; the matron in the bosom of her admiring children; and the father as he dreams fondly of the fortune and glory of his aspiring sons*—let it fire the man of business at his place of merchandise; the lawyer among his briefs; the mechanic in his work-shop; the planter in his fields; the laborer as he plies his pruning-hook and follows his plough;—let the trumpet blow in Zion, and let all her watchmen lift up their voice; let all the people, everywhere, old and young, bond and free, take up the war-cry, and say, each to his neighbor, "Gather ye together, and come against them, and rise up to the battle."

> "Rise, fellow-men, our country yet remains!
> By that dread name we wave the sword on high,
> And swear for her to live, with her to die."

---

* "Let them teach their infant tongue,
To call upon the heroes old,
In their child language, and thus mould
Their growing spirit in the flame
Of patriot love, that by each name
A patriot's birth-right they may claim."

ARTICLE II.

ON THE NATURE AND USES OF ART.*

10. Of all departments of Art, perhaps the most difficult to reduce to the principles laid down above, is *Landscape Painting.* This fact, however, only shows that landscape painting is less understood, and less capable of analysis, than other departments of art; and it still remains true of this, as of other departments, that only in so far as the foregoing principles are, either consciously or unconsciously, embodied by the artist, does it deserve to rank among the fine arts. As we have already said, to the popular mind the ideal of the landscape picture is one in which, taking the frame for a window, we are supposed to be looking out upon an actual scene in nature. Now, we do not hesitate to say that such deception is not the object of true art. A true landscape picture is not a mere copy of nature, but some thing different from nature; and the difference is made with the design of opening the eyes of the spectator to what he, perhaps, would not see in nature, viz., her divine ideal beauty.

The object of all art is to exhibit the divine in nature, whether human or external. But human art, like human thought, employed itself first in exhibiting the divine as displayed in *man*, and only later the divine as displayed in *external nature.* There has been a gradual change in art, similar to that which has taken place in science. The tendency of ancient civilization was to degrade nature, in comparison with the god-like dignity of man. In modern times, on the contrary, the dignity of man is in danger of being lost in the bewildered contemplation of the immen-

---

* Continued from page 348.

sity and grandeur of external nature. The Greek looked upon man alone as divine, and, therefore, alone as the worthy object of philosophy and art. Nature, to him, was of importance only in its subserviency to man. The infinite, the divine, the sacred, the holy in external nature was hidden from his eyes, or else took the *human forms* of nymphs and dryads. That intense, almost morbid, love of external nature, *for its own sake*, so common in modern minds of a poetic turn, seems to have been entirely wanting among the Greeks. In such a condition, neither a science nor an art of external nature could possibly exist. If there was any representation of external nature, it could only be a pure imitative representation of those products of nature most useful to man; as, for instance, the painted fruits of Zeuxis, which deceived the birds. In a word, in such a condition of things, landscape painting, which is a representation of the divine in external nature, could not exist. For this reason, landscape painting is, even yet, less mature and less understood than any other species of art. Statuary culminated among the Greeks; painting of human figures in the sixteenth century of our era; while landscape painting is only now culminating, as the natural result of the increasing knowledge and increasing love of nature. Even yet, however, to attain the ideal in landscape painting is more difficult than in any other species of art, and the genuine appreciation of landscape painting the rarest accomplishment among connoisseurs. The pleasure, however, to be derived from a truly great ideal landscape, though less intense and less readily excited, is purer, calmer, holier, and more truly æsthetic, than, perhaps, that derived from any other species of art.

It will be easily understood, therefore, why it is more difficult to define in what consists the ideal in landscape painting, and why it is more difficult to apply the principles laid down in the beginning of this article, with clearness, to this department of art.

In landscape, as in all art, the object of the painter should not be to reproduce what every one already sees much better in nature, but to open our eyes to what we do *not* see, and thus to teach us *how* to see the divine in nature. This is done in landscape, in the same manner as in other species of art. External nature may be perfectly adapted to cultivate the unfallen man; but to the fallen man, nature conceals, instead of revealing the divine. To the fallen man, the divine in nature is involved in and obscured by the material; the *noble* is hidden by the *common;* the general conception of the whole is lost in the distraction of apparently insignificant and conflicting detail; the æsthetic is overborne by the sensuous impression; and thus our higher nature is brought into bondage to the lower. If in the contemplation of nature as displayed in humanity, the high and the noble is involved in and *overborne* by the passionate and emotional, and the result is *intoxication;* in the contemplation of external nature the high and noble is involved in and obscured by the merely *common*, and the result is either stolid indifference or a pleasurable sense of agreeableness. In both, the object of art is to set our higher nature free. The external world addresses both our highest nature—the divine within us—and our lowest animal nature; but we do not, any of us, see all that she reveals to us. Some see only what she reveals through the senses, such as the greenness, the flatness, the freshness of meadows, the coolness and shadiness of woods, the sparkling of dew, the wetness after rain, the comfort and plenty indicated by grazing herds and substantial farm buildings; others, in addition to these, see also the harmonious relation of parts, of mountain crest and slope with plain and lake, of nestling cottage and nibbling flocks, and all the infinite associations of antiquity, of eternal endurance, of power and grandeur, of peaceful happiness and domestic love, which cluster around these; to still others, she reveals the divine in its oneness, as perfect beauty and holiness, and teaches the

innermost secret of secrets—her connexion with the invisible. Now the common artist, seeking only popularity, strives to reproduce, with the utmost accuracy, what every one, even the clown or the contemplative ruminant, might see; in other words, he strives to make a deceptive imitation of nature. This deceptive imitation exhibits a certain cleverness in the artist, which is easily appreciated and universally admired. The artist, therefore, gains his end, which is popularity. The great ideal artist, on the other hand, in his picture, sacrifices in some measure the superficial, sensuous, and therefore deceptive resemblance to nature, for the deep, spiritual, and therefore non-deceptive resemblance—the divine significance of nature. He softens somewhat, or at least neglects somewhat the sensuous impression, that he may bring out in bolder relief the higher, intellectual impression; he selects the really characteristic and significant from the obscuring multiplicity of insignificant and distracting detail, and by *gentle emphasis* here and there, directs the imagination and excites the æsthetic faculty; he sets the intellect free from the bondage of sense, and brings the whole nature into a condition of healthy and harmonious spiritual activity.

The test of the noblest in landscape painting is also similar to that in other species of art. The more truth of all sorts, both high and low, the artist crowds upon the canvass, the nobler the work, provided always the emphasis on the high be sufficiently strong to make these predominant. The greater the variety of impression, high and low, which is made upon the mind of the spectator, the nobler the picture, provided always the artist has succeeded in coördinating these into a harmonious, living unit. If the commoner truth, the truth of the senses, is too much neglected, the work is unreal and cold; if the higher truth is not seen, or is neglected, the work is low and imitative. Judged by this standard, the best modern landscape painting is far superior to that of any previous period, for it contains much more

truth. It is the result of a more complete knowledge of nature than that of the school of Claude and Poussin; these latter sacrificing all truth of detail to what they conceived to be general effect.

11. Poetry, like all art, addresses itself to the whole spiritual nature of man, the highest æsthetic nature or sense of beauty, the imagination, the understanding, the emotion, the passions, and the senses. Poetry differs from prose, both in its *essential nature* and in its *form*. It differs in its essential nature, inasmuch as prose addresses only the emotions and the understanding, while poetry, in addition to these, addresses also the imagination and the æsthetic sense. Whatever in literature addresses these latter, is in so far poetic, whatever be its form. But poetry, again, differs from prose also in *form*. Poetry is written in verse. This form, however, is only significant, in so far as it serves to carry out and more fully express the essential nature of poetry. Form which is not the embodiment, and the express image, of essential nature—form without substance, mere hollow form—is always detestable. On the other hand, essential nature, without appropriate form, only imperfectly affects the human mind. Thus there is much verse which deserves not the name of poetry, since it has only the form, without the essence; again, there is much in the form of prose which, as it touches the imagination and the æsthetic sense, is essentially poetry, though the full effect of such poetry is marred for the want of appropriate form. But as form must for ever, in the popular mind, stand for substance, and must, therefore, always determine the names of things, we shall speak of *poetry only in the form of verse.*

We have already said that form can not be of any use, unless it be *appropriate;*—that the only object of verse must be to assist in carrying out more perfectly the essential object and end of poetry, viz., to touch more strongly the imagination and æsthetic faculty. But it may be asked, how does verse contribute to this effect? This is a question

the complete answer to which is very difficult. Verse bears the same relation to poetry which marble does to sculpture, or pigments and canvass do to painting. It is its *appropriate material.* But, as the sculptor may use *clay*, so may the poet use prose, though with infinite loss of effect. The effect of the use of verse by the poet, is similar to the use of appropriate materials in the other departments of art; it *removes the work out of the realm of mere common nature, into that of the ideal;* and this always contributes, as we have already abundantly shown, to set free the imagination and the æsthetic faculty. Verse, too, like the material of other departments of art, from the very fact that it is, in the ordinary sense of the term, *unnatural* and *unreal*, less powerfully affects the common emotions and passions, and is, therefore, (strange as this may seem to some,) less deceptive than prose. If the artist wishes to produce a deceptive imitation of nature—to affect us exactly as nature usually does—he uses prose. Thus in the drama, the most deceptively natural works—the plays, the acting of which seem most like *real* life, and which attempt to delude the spectators into a belief of actual occurrences—the plays, too, which most completely unman and prostrate an audience with emotion—are written in prose. Verse, by a certain air of unreality, removes the work into the realm of the ideal, and we are not cheated. Thus, the best dramatic works are always written in verse, and only low or mistaken art makes use of prose. The Greek drama, and the highest ideal plays of Shakspeare, are written in verse, while much of the modern drama, intended only to intoxicate, is written in prose. Schiller's earlier dramas, such as "The Robbers,"—while he was yet young, his feelings tumultuous and taste unformed, when he strove only after violent effect—are written in prose; while "William Tell," "the Piccolomini," and "the Death of Wallenstein," the products of his mature genius, when he had risen into the calmer, purer region of the ideal, are written in verse. In

the Greek drama, the ideal effect of verse was still farther enhanced by the use of the mask and the cothurnus. These, by giving noble repose and calmness to the face, and superhuman stature and dignity to the form, together with the absence of any elaborate scenery or stage effect, still farther removed the work from the actual into the ideal, and prevented any possibility of delusive belief in reality.

There is another effect of verse, which eminently adapts it as a material of art; an effect which is found, also, in all genuine art, but which, like every thing highest in our nature, is undefinable to the understanding, because not capable of complete analysis. Those who have felt it will understand; to others, we shall speak unintelligibly. There is some thing in the best verse, aside from the thoughts which it is supposed to embody—the thoughts which would still be embodied, if changed into prose—some thing contained in the very form itself—in the music of the verse—in the harmony of numbers—some thing which does not embody, but suggests ideas—ideas which can not be expressed in words, but only in music. This musical element, as we shall call it, for want of a better name, touches the highest æsthetic sense, and is, in fact, the highest and most ethereal essence of poetry; it teaches nothing, perhaps—it conveys no distinct and definite thoughts—but, like music, it simply removes the veil which separates us from the higher ethereal region of pure spirit, and permits us a moment to gaze. This musical rhythm of harmonious numbers must not be confounded with the regular, beating measure of verse-makers—the "false gallop of verse." Regular beating of time is not music. Pope is the most dexterous of verse-makers, but there is not one particle of genuine music in his verse. Shakspeare is often irregular, and yet his verse is full of the most exquisite music. In fact, really musical verse can not be written, unless the soul is full of music in the highest and holiest sense; unless it be inspired

with the divine harmony of the universe—the music of the spheres. Among English poets, Shakspeare and Milton stand first in this respect. They are always full of it. But it may be found, also, in many pieces of Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, and particularly, we think, in Tennyson.

But poetry, like all other species of art, may fail of its high mission, by attempting a low and servile imitation of common nature. Like painting, it may imitate nature, by addressing itself only to the understanding and the lower feelings, and thus become merely *common* and *prosaic;* or, like the drama and the novel, it may imitate nature, in its overpowering emotional effect, and thus become *morbid* and *intoxicating.* Thus, then, there are two kinds of poetry which fail of the true mission of art. One is, in fact, not poetry at all, except in *form.* It is nothing more than good composition, full of acuteness and sense, done into verse. Such is the poetry of Pope and his school. The other is, indeed, poetry, since it appeals powerfully to the imagination; but only of the second order, since the pure æsthetic sense is overpowered by emotion and passion. This species of poetry, therefore, is always more or less morbid and intoxicating, and in extreme examples, unless rejected at once by the instincts of good taste, actually and virulently poisonous. Most of the modern English poets, and, we believe, modern poets generally, are more or less infected with this fault. It is detectible, in various proportions, in Byron, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Mrs. Browning, Edgar Poe, and becomes disgusting in Bailey and Alexander Smith. But the best and truest poetry, like all truest art, produces entirely different effects upon the mind. It excites, like the last, the passions, emotions, imagination, but also, and in the highest degree, the pure æsthetic sense. Instead of unhinging, unsettling, intoxicating the soul, producing ennui, lassitude and discontent, it strengthens, braces, purifies, and elevates the soul, producing noble calmness and exalted harmony. The best Greek poets,

and, among moderns, Dante, Chaucer, Spenser, Shakspeare, Milton, and, in their best pieces, Goethe and Schiller, are examples of this class. There are, then, three classes of poets. Commencing with the lowest, they are: First, the unimaginative poets, like Pope and the whole tribe of verse-makers—poets only in form, not in substance: Second, the imaginative and passionate poets: Third, the true ideal poets. The first, in their best examples, are apt to please men of mere cleverness, without imagination; or, as they are commonly called, men of common sense and judgment: the second are apt to please the young and imaginative, but unformed: the third, men of true æsthetic culture.

The difference between these classes may, perhaps, be brought out more distinctly, by characterizing the state of mind under which each produces a work of art. Suppose some object, event, or condition, which powerfully moves the whole soul, is presented to the mind for contemplation. It may be the present condition of society, its abuses, its vices, its injustice, its oppression, as affecting ourselves or others; it may be our own internal distractions and struggles; it may be the loss of a dear object of affection, after the first storm of agony is past. The man of mere sense or understanding, with sufficient cleverness, embodies it in verse without *real* feeling or imagination, although there may be affectation of both in conventional phrases; or, if the object contemplated be society, or humanity in general, his verse is apt to take the form of clever wit or satire. On the other hand, a man of keen sensibilities and fine imagination, but without sufficient religious or æsthetic nature; a man of fine, but not strong nature—delicately organized, but the *equilibrium trembling and unstable*, like Keats or Shelley; or, perhaps, a man, like Byron, of strong volcanic passions and powerful imagination, but without sufficient ballast of self-control—without strength of intellect and will sufficient to bring his internal tumult into

harmony; such a man will embody his mental condition—his breathing, laboring thoughts—in words which burn like a consuming fire. He is overmastered by his emotions and sensibilities; his mental balance is overthrown; and his poetry is the image of his own tumultuous feelings—of his own condition of unrest; imagination is active and strong, but involved in too strong emotion, and struggles in vain to be free. Only he who can subdue this internal tumult; who, if his sensibilities and emotions are strong, his æsthetic faculty and will are still stronger; who subordinates his emotions to his higher nature, and stands serene and calm, though at white heat; only *he* can be the great poet. In him only is the imagination entirely free to soar unto the purer regions of thought, above the smoke and vapors of the reeking earth. His poetry expresses this internal condition of calmness; his imagination warms and vivifies, but scorches not, nor blasts; his thoughts illumine, but dazzle not.

But by many, in fact, most persons of poetical temperament, particularly among the young and ardent, the second class is most appreciated and most loved, because they are essentially the poets of *the age.* The first class of poets are above their age; in fact, above all ages. They see through the fashion in which each age clothes itself, into the very heart of humanity itself. They stand above, as calm, though not unsympathizing spectators, while the turbid, tumultuous stream of time and human life rushes by. The second class of poets, like common mortals, are involved and struggling in the stream beneath. Is it to be wondered at, then, that these should be the most prized by the young and imaginative, since they echo their own longings, their own strugglings, their own cries of agony and despair? This class of poets and their sympathizers would seem to be particularly characteristic of the present age. In all previous ages, it would seem that men were mostly referable to two classes: those who stood above the age,

and those who were completely and tranquilly immersed in it. In this age only—this age of intellectual anarchy, this age of transition and unrest—do we find many strong, manly spirits, struggling nobly, but unavailingly in the boiling flood, and crying for deliverance. But alas, it is an age without faith. To whom shall they cry for deliverance?—who shall say to the raging waters, "Peace, be still."

A little while ago, we used the expression, "poetical temperament," an expression which is perfectly familiar and intelligible to all, and yet, we think, characteristic of the present age, and of the second class of poets. Art, and particularly poetry, is now looked upon as the result of a particular temperament; a peculiar unbalance of the mind, resembling madness; "a fine phrensy," which "robs the mind of itself;" a temperament and character of mind utterly unlike that which excels in other and more sober departments, and, therefore, which utterly unfits for the practical duties of life; and some silly young persons, in the conceit of this temperament, even affect to despise these practical duties as unfit for their soaring spirits. Now, we are satisfied that such a view of poetry would have been quite unintelligible to the ancient Greek, or even to a modern, in the golden period of art. The famous Greek poets were possessed of the best culture of their times, in every department; many of them were skilled in mathematics, in science, and in philosophy. See, again, the general culture of Michael Angelo, and, still more wonderful, of Leonardo da Vinci; the symmetrical, though incomplete culture of Shakspeare; the all-sidedness of Goethe. In fact, it may be asserted that a really healthy and great art is always the result of a complete culture; the flower and fruit of a perfected humanity. It is only in this age, when symmetrical culture is so rare; when the demon of utilitarianism has subdivided all pursuits, both intellectual and physical, to such a hurtful extent; when even education itself is made a mere apprenticeship to

business pursuits; until all symmetry of proportion, all resemblance, and, therefore, all sympathy between men of different pursuits is destroyed;—it is only in this age, when, by the hot-house culture of the school and college, humanity has been forced into an inconceivable number of permanent varieties, almost simulating different species;—it is only in this age, and under these unnatural circumstances, that humanity gives rise to monstrous blooms; splendid, it may be—wonderful, surprising, the pride of the gardener—but without fragrance and without seed. And thus we have poet-fanciers, as we have rose-fanciers; some fancying one variety and some another, according to temperament; while many look upon the whole art of floriculture as frivolous, and the cultivation of good pot herbs as much more sensible. But, must this be always so? No; this transition state of anarchy and unrest, of division and want of sympathy, must pass away; there must come a time (are we not all yearning for it even now?) when the hearts of men shall beat more in unison; when, in fact, there shall be a common human heart pulsating and sending life to every class of society, and uniting all in the bonds of sympathy and love. In this *great* and common heart of humanity, a great and healthy art will again take root and bloom.

12. MUSIC can not, in any sense, be said to be an *imitative* art. It is strictly and purely *human;* there is nothing in external nature which at all resembles it, and of which it purports to be a representation. Still, as being a human product, it is in some sense a representation of *human nature*—addresses itself to our human nature, high and low—and is, therefore, subject to the laws which we have applied to other branches of art. In some respects, however, music is superior to all other branches, as a means of illustrating the true nature of art.

We have already said that music, like all art, addresses both our lower and higher natures—both the sensuous, the

emotional, and the highest æsthetic. Hence, like all other branches of art, music may enervate and enslave, or may purify, elevate, and strengthen the mind. If the sensuous predominates, it simply enervates, lulls into repose, or steeps in delicious dream; if the emotional predominates, it lashes into undue excitement, and intoxicates. Only when all these exist, but are subordinate to the æsthetic impression, does it purify and strengthen. There are thus three different kinds of music, essentially distinct, although running, through infinite gradations, into one another. The first is the ballad music, or the original music indigenous to every people—sweet, simple, and natural. The second is the Italian; and the third, the German school of music. These may be considered to rise in the order in which we have mentioned them. And yet, the first and last may be considered the purer and more healthy; the second, more morbid and dangerous.

Let us, then, compare these three kinds of music, as to their effects upon the human mind. The best ballad music is pure, healthy, but simple, and therefore comparatively low. It induces a condition of serenity and harmony of mind; but, as the harmony is simple, and the sensuous and emotional impression is gentle, the mental harmony induced is, also, rather passive than active; rather *pure* than *noble;* we have the æsthetic condition, but not of the highest kind. In the Italian music, on the contrary, the emotional impression is often too powerful, the mental balance is overthrown, the highest æsthetic pleasure is overborne by the strength of emotion. It is, therefore, to some extent unhealthy and intoxicating. In both ballad and Italian music, melody, or *consecutive harmony*, is the distinguishing characteristic, *chordal harmony* being entirely subordinate. Now, it would seem that melody more powerfully affects the emotions, and harmony, *i. e.*, chordal harmony, the æsthetic sense. In ballad music, the melody is simple, and the passion is not sufficient to overthrow the mental equilibrium;

but in Italian music the melody is more complex, and the emotion is so powerful as to endanger the intellectual harmony. In German music, on the contrary, chordal harmony is no longer subordinate to melody, but is itself the distinguishing characteristic. In the two preceding, we have only a melody, with an *accompaniment* intended to add to and improve the air. In German music, there is no accompaniment in this sense. The accompaniment (so called) is an organic portion of the work of art, inseparable from it. A simple and, perhaps, by itself an unattractive melody, is combined with an exceedingly complex harmony, and the connexion is so close and organic that a single note in the complex arrangement omitted, destroys the whole beauty. The accompaniment is not here added as ornament, as a rich dress enhancing the beauty of what is in itself beautiful, but is a necessary part of a complex unit, of a perfect organism. Now, as complex harmony touches only the highest æsthetic sense, it is evident that in German music the æsthetic predominates over the emotional, and, therefore, the effect upon the mind is that of elevated serenity; no longer, however, like ballad music, *passive serenity*, but harmonious *activity;* an activity which is proportionate to the complexity of the elements which are combined into organic unity, *i. e.*, to the complexity of the musical harmony and the strength of the emotion, subordinated to the æsthetic faculty. In comparing these three again, it is seen that the first and third are truly healthy; the second somewhat morbid. The first is simple, natural harmony: the third, the harmony of perfect culture: the second is comparable to the unsettled transition state between nature and perfected art. The first is the purity, simplicity, and innocence of childhood: the second, the turbulence of passionate youth: the third, the calmness, the peace, the harmony, which comes of self-conquest and victory over the world. The first is like the simplicity, the purity, the completeness of Greek art: the second, the incomplete-

ness, the morbidness, the enthusiasm, the craving unrest of modern art: the third is the type of the completed modern art; higher in its ideal, more complex in its harmony, but, for that very reason, not yet attaining completeness, except in music. The first is a *relaxation* from the harassing cares and anxieties of life; a *rest* from the weariness of unsatisfied desire; a rest which reminds us of the simplicity of early periods, and "dallies with the innocence of love like the old age;" a rest which carries us back to the purity of childhood, and thus purifies the mind, recuperates the strength, and prepares for *renewed* activity. The second excites, intoxicates, unfits for life. The third is *recreation*, rather than *relaxation;* it is *harmonious activity*, rather than *rest;* it not only *purifies*, but *ennobles.*

Ballad music, we think, will be admitted by all cultivated persons to be a simpler, and, in so far, a lower order of music. But the Italian and German schools have their advocates for supremacy, even among the most cultivated persons. Let us further compare these, as to their effects. We listen to an Italian opera; perhaps one of Bellini's is the best type. The whole power of the opera is concentrated in the solos and duets, because melody and emotional effect are, in the end, to be accomplished. Everything else, the chorus, the recitative, the orchestral accompaniment, all are subordinate to this end—all are but effective ornament and dress—all are but means to keep up the interest, and prepare the mind for the brilliant and passionate *arias.* In the execution of these gems of the Italian opera, the most passionate acting is added to increase the emotional effect. The result is, that the combined effect of acting and singing, upon susceptible minds, is overpowering. The spectator and listener is unmanned, dissolved in tears, crushed, and subdued; in a word, intoxicated with emotion; his mental strength prostrated, and himself unfitted for life. The whole object of the Italian opera is thus to storm the citadel of the human soul, and carry it away captive. In

the best German operas, on the contrary, such as those of Mozart, or better, as being more typical, those of Weber, Meyerbeer, or, yet still better, (for the opera does not completely embody the idea of German, as it does that of Italian music,) in the oratorios of Handel and Haydn, and the complex music of Beethoven and Mendelssohn, the effect is quite different. The German opera, for instance, does not, like the Italian, consist of gems strung upon a silver thread—every thing is not subordinate to the arias; on the contrary, there is an organic connexion in every part; the scenery, the orchestral accompaniment, the arias, the recitative, the choruses, all combine to produce one single effect, and that effect is high and noble in proportion to the diversity of the parts thus combined into unity. The culminating points of this general effect, the flower and fruit of this organism, are not the solos, but rather the trios, the quartettes and the choruses. Chordal harmony prevails over passionate melody. The soul is not overwhelmed, *unmanned*, led away, a submissive captive, into sweet slavery; but carried upwards to the seventh heaven, calm, strong, pure, deeply moved, but master of itself; the countenance transfigured, by noble emotion, into some thing divine; perhaps in tears, but tears of joy and ecstasy, rather than grief; tears which indicate strength, not weakness; tears which show the earthly casket giving way under the pressure of the swelling spirit. This effect, too, is more purely musical, more entirely independent of adventitious aid, than in the case of the Italian opera. It has been truly said, by Goethe, that musical effect is always greater when the singers are concealed. There is no doubt that the purest æsthetic effect of music is greatest when every other sense is shut; hence the habit of shutting the eyes when deeply affected by music. Now, German music will stand this test infinitely better than the Italian. The whole effect of a well-executed Italian solo is far greater with the eyes open. Why? Because the powerful emotional effect is the *combined result* of

the music and the acting. The German quartette or chorus, on the contrary, only expresses *noble* emotion, and noble emotion is always calm and self-possessed, and all violent action is therefore unbecoming. The German, it is true, is less universally appreciated, because less passionate. It is, also, less vociferously applauded, even by those who do appreciate; for this, also, is unbecoming holy and noble emotion.

Perhaps, in philosophic strictness, there are but two kinds of *perfect* music, viz., ballad music and German music. The first is simple; the second, complex. In the one, melody predominates; in the other, harmony. But each of these may be again divided into the true and the false, the healthy and the morbid. In the first, the false consists in the predominance of the sensuous, and the effect is to steep the soul in delicious dream and weak reverie; in the second, the false consists rather in the predominance of the emotional and passionate, and the effect is delirious excitement, intoxication. The simple music, however, is much less apt to be false than the complex; and falseness is, also, less dangerous in this case; hence it is more natural to distinguish, as we have done above, three kinds. The true and false in music are admirably expressed and distinguished in Milton's "Comus." Comus himself, speaking of the Lady's singing, says:

"I have oft heard
My mother, Circe, with the Syrens three,
Amidst the flowery-kirtled naiades,
Culling their potent herbs and baleful drugs,
Who, as they sung, would take the *prisoned* soul,
And lap it in Elysium,"

"Yet they in pleasing numbers *lulled the sense,*
And *in a sweet madness robbed it of itself;*
But such a *sacred* and home-felt delight,
Such sober certainty of waking bliss,
I never heard till now."

We can illustrate the three different kinds of music still further, by reference to the musical instruments which best express each. Perhaps the best expression of ballad music is the *flute*. The music of this instrument is sweet, simple, pure melody, but apt to pass into sweet melancholy, sentimentality, and lovesickness; lulling the sense, like an opiate, into a state of passive happiness, weakening, instead of strengthening the mind. Italian music is best expressed by the *violin*. No instrument so touches, so sweeps over, and sways every emotion and passion of the human soul, as this. The most extravagant merriment, the most touching melancholy, the most overpowering pathos, are evoked by turns, and with equal ease. The violin is certainly the most powerful of all instruments, in its effects on the human soul; in some sense, the most thoroughly human instrument which exists; but it touches most powerfully the feelings and emotions which belong to this world, and, therefore, is in some sense the most worldly of all instruments. There is, therefore, a philosphic foundation for the religious objection to this instrument, although the objection has been blind, and therefore absurd in its expression. The German music can not find fitting expression in any single instrument. A chorus of voices, or a full orchestra, is necessary for its full expression. Perhaps, of single instruments, the organ best expresses it; but its essential and distinguishing peculiarities are brought out in strongest relief by the piano. The power of the violin consists in passionate melody; the power of the piano, in the expression of complex harmony. Of course, the highest effect of music can only be produced by the union of these. The organ approaches nearest this ideal—is, therefore, the noblest of musical instruments, and therefore very properly dedicated to the church. But, in the expression of the most complex harmony, even the organ is inferior to the piano. The great weakness of the piano consists in its inability to sustain its

notes, and therefore the very imperfect manner in which it expresses melody; and therefore, also, its impotence in expressing strong emotion. But this very weakness on one side constitutes its strength on another, and that the highest. The very imperfection of its melody gives a power of harmony beyond all other instruments. There are chords and successions of chords in German music, so complex as to be entirely beyond the power of the human mind to grasp as perfect chords. The chord must be *broken* before the effect of the whole can be felt, and at the same time each note distinctly heard, and its part in the general effect truly weighed. This capacity for *broken chords*—upon which the highest effect of the piano is dependent—is itself dependent upon the inability of sustaining notes; and hence every attempt to remedy this defect, by æolian attachments or otherwise, must prove a failure. Broken chords, however, like "grace notes," "runs," "trills," and all other artifices of brilliant effect, in the hands of second-rate performers, are liable to much abuse and affectation. It should seldom be used, unless the harmony is too complex to be otherwise grasped.

The piano, then, bears somewhat the same relation to German which the violin does to Italian music. The violin moves us more deeply, but the piano touches a higher sense. The violin is appreciated by all, and under all circumstances; amid the excitement of the concert or ball-room, no less than in the parlor; it compels admiration; it compels attention, because it touches strongly. The piano speaks only to those of cultivated minds. The mind must be prepared, the soul must be attuned, or no note vibrates in unison. In the concert-room it is nothing; the sense which it touches is too high and delicate to withstand noise and glare. "And yet," it will be objected, "the piano is the most common of all instruments; the piano is used constantly in the concert-room." The reason of this is, that the piano is also remarkable for brilliant mechanical execution. Every body

appreciates this, and admires it. But brilliant mechanical execution is comparatively a very low species of art. This is the reason why so many frivolous persons admire the piano, and so many persons of strong but uncultivated musical feeling despise it. The piano is really the poorest of instruments, unless one appreciates the most complex German music.

There is a story told of Beethoven, which, whether true or not, illustrates admirably the German ideal of musical art. It is said that the celebrated song, so well known to lovers of music, "*the Adelaide*," was composed by Beethoven, as an expression of his despair, on the night of the nuptials of the woman he passionately loved. Every one who is acquainted with the piece knows what agony of emotion, what wailings of grief, are expressed by it. It is universally acknowledged to be a masterpiece, in which the most powerful emotional melody is combined in a wonderful manner with the most complex harmony. But it is also said that Beethoven, in the full maturity of genius, acknowledged that he was ashamed of the piece. He composed it when he was not master of himself; when he was writhing in agony; when his emotion had, to some extent, enslaved him, and when, therefore, he could not be in the æsthetic condition; and therefore the piece was not a true work of art. His reverence for art was such that he looked upon it as sacrilege to express by it any but the highest and holiest feelings.

What we have said above completely settles the disputes concerning the relative merits of the different schools of music. It is not uncommon to find men with strong and genuine, but uncultivated musical feeling, who contend that no music is real and genuine but the simple ballad; that the Italian is but wild and phrenzied screaming, and the German unintelligible and discordant jargon; and the admiration of these is either the result of perverted taste or of affectation. On the other hand, how common to find the

"professor" of music turning up his nose at ballad music and negro melodies, as unworthy of notice. Now, all this is evidently either the result of imperfect culture or of affectation. In case it is genuine, we have here two classes of men, each despising the taste of the other; each feeling music in one of its phases, and unable to appreciate it in another. The two classes have been cultivated in different directions; their natures have become essentially different; and, of course, their taste and feelings, being the image of their natures, must also entirely differ. It is this condition of things, so common among men, especially in modern times, which gives rise to the adage, "*de gustibus non est disputandum*," and to the philosophy that "taste and sense of beauty are mere things of association and education." The same difference of culture and of nature gives rise to endless differences in the department of philosophy, and to the adage, "every man has a right to his own opinion;" as if truth was of no importance, but only individual subjective opinion. Thus both taste and philosophy become the result of subjective temperament and education. But, in fact, as a true philosophy includes, understands, and rationally interprets all mere opinions; so a true æsthetic culture includes all partial cultures. As in the field of intellect, no man who has only *his own opinions*, has any right to erect these, (which are the mere result of feelings, passions, interests, etc.,) into a philosophy; but only he who has gone through and included within himself all partial and subjective opinions, and interpreted them by the laws of reason—who, in a word, has no longer any opinion, but a philosophy, in which subjective opinion becomes sober certainty—has any right or any power to teach other men: so, also, in matters of taste; no one who does not include within himself the partial tastes and cultures of other men, has any right to judge between them. The man who does not actually feel, and deeply enjoy, any department of art, has no ability to judge at all where that department is con-

cerned. Only he who deeply feels every species of music, from the simplest negro melody to the most complex German oratorio; who has passed through the successive stages embodied permanently in other men; who, in his childhood, has been deeply moved, even to tears, by simple melody; in his ardent, impulsive, and unbalanced youth, has been wild with delight and extravagant excitement, on hearing the Italian opera; but who, in his maturity, has recognized the higher and purer beauty of the German music, and who, moreover, has included all previous epochs and tastes in his completed culture: we repeat, only *he* is in a position, or has any right, to judge as to their relative merits.

13. There are certain philosophical principles connected with the nature of art, which are best discussed at this point, since, for reasons which will presently appear, most of the illustrations will be drawn from music.

(*a.*) Music is the simplest and purest embodiment of the principles of art. The essential nature of art is here divested of every complication; the problem of the philosophy of art is reduced to its simplest terms. If in any department we can discover the essential nature—the simple and general principle which underlies all the various and complex forms of art, and concerning which there has been so much dispute, surely we are most likely to do so here. This is but the application of the "*comparative method,*" which, on other occasions, we have shown to be so successful in all the higher and more complex departments of knowledge. As in organic science, the study of the higher organisms has been barren of results, so far as concerns the establishing of any philosophic principles of organization, so in art, the study of the higher and more complex departments, such as poetry, will be equally barren in philosophic results. But, as in organic science, philosophic insight is obtained by the study of the simplest organisms, and extensive comparison of organisms in the scale of in-

creasing complexity; so, also, in art, the essential principles are only to be understood by an attentive study of the simplest departments, and by extensive comparison of different branches with one another.

We have said that music is the simplest department of art. We ought rather to have said that music shares this place with *sculpture.* The one is the simplest embodiment of the laws of *harmony of sound;* the other, of the laws of *harmony of form.* These, therefore, it seems to us, form *the two bases of art.* All other arts are the meeting and mingling of these two in various proportions. One might be called the *spiritual*, and the other the *material element.* Now, in the construction of a science of æsthetics, we must evidently build upon these two bases. In this respect, the science of æsthetics is similar to sociology, and for the reason that they are both equally connected with our material and our spiritual nature. As the science of sociology is built up first upon the facts of history—and thus we have descriptive sociology—then these facts are reduced to formal laws, and we have phœnomenal or formal sociology; lastly, these phœnomenal laws are reduced to the more fundamental laws of organic science, on the one hand, and of pyschology, on the other, and we have a scientific sociology: so, also, a truly scientific æsthetics must commence with the facts of art—*descriptive æsthetics;* it must then reduce these to formal laws of its own—*formal æsthetics;* lastly, it must subordinate these phœnomenal or formal laws to the more fundamental laws of organic forms, or morphology, on the one hand, and of spiritual harmony, or psychology, on the other; and thus we have a *scientific æsthetics.* These connexions, on the one hand with morphology, and on the other with psychology, are made directly and most simply through sculpture and music. But, as in sociology, on account of our more complete acquaintance with material sciences, the connexion with organic science is much more complete, and capable of being traced minutely in

doctrine and method, (as we have attempted to show in an article on sociology,)* while the connexion with spiritual science can only be indicated: so, also, in æsthetics, and for the same reason, the connexion with morphology can be traced with some distinctness, (as we have attempted to show in an article on morphology and its connexion with fine art;) † but its connexion with psychical science we at that time saw too imperfectly even to indicate distinctly. In both cases, *i. e.*, in sociology and in æsthetics, the *spiritual* connexion is *most essential*—the spiritual basis is most fundamental, though least understood. In art, whether *social* or *fine*, the human *spirit* is the active agent, but the material upon which it operates is matter. It acts according to its own laws, but, at the same time, conditioned by the laws of matter. In sociology, we have the laws of the human spirit, conditioned by the laws of organic *force;* in æsthetics, we have the laws of spirit, conditioned by the laws of organic *form.* Thus, the laws of spirit and the laws of matter are impressed both upon sociology and upon æsthetics, one as the active agent, the other as the limiting condition; but in both, also, we must exhaust the laws of the limiting conditions before we can eliminate these, and begin to understand the laws of the active spirit. Thus, the scientific connexion of sociology and æsthetics with organic science must be fully understood, before we can begin to understand their connexion with psychical science. We have attempted to do this in the two articles already referred to.

Now, as we have already said, in both social science and æsthetics the psychical basis is the most essential and fundamental; and social organization, or art, is high and pure in proportion as the laws of spirit predominate over the laws of matter—in proportion as the active spirit controls the limiting conditions—in other words, in proportion as the spirit is *free;* but it is, at the same time, great, and

* So. Pres. Review, Vol. 13, p. 39. † Do., Vol. 12, p. 83.

noble, and strong, in proportion to the strength and complexity of the limiting conditions thus overcome and coördinated. This is but another and more fundamental form of stating what we have already so often insisted on. Our lower nature, emotions, passions, senses, etc., as being more intimately connected with our material nature, stand as conditions limiting, often involving, obscuring, overpowering, the pure active spirit, which must be set free by art, or by culture of some sort. Now, these two elements, the spiritual and the material, the active and the limiting, exist in all art, as in every human work, but in different proportions. The spiritual element predominates in music; the material element in sculpture. But, as the spirit is the active agent, and, therefore, the spiritual element of art the most fundamental and essential, it follows that music is really the purest and freest embodiment of art. The free activity of the human spirit is here less entangled in the limiting conditions of our material nature, than in any other species of art. It follows, then, from what we have said, that although music and sculpture are the two coördinate bases of art, yet that music is really the most essential and most fundamental; and therefore a true philosophy of art—a true theory of the beautiful—aside from its connexion with morphology, can best be obtained by a profound study of the philosophy of music, and then, by comparison, tracing the principles of this philosophy through other departments.

It is not our intention here to propose any theory of the beautiful. We have only pointed out one method, and we think the only scientific method, by which a sound theory can be arrived at. We wish now to test by this method some of the theories which have been proposed.

According to a large class of writers, the perception of beauty is a sensuous perception—the pleasure derived from the contemplation of beauty is a purely sensuous enjoyment—and therefore incapable of analysis. "Beauty of

color, or beauty of sound," they say, "is, surely, a pure sensuous perception." True: but it does not, therefore, follow that the enjoyment of art is a sensuous enjoyment. The mistake here is the common one among a certain class of philosophers; in fact, the mistake of all the old philosophers, viz., that of the mere systematizing of notions embodied in popular terms, without sufficient analysis. The fact is, beauty of color or sound is not beauty at all, in any philosophical sense. If a mere agreeable impression on the sense of sight or hearing is beauty, then an agreeable impression on any other sense should equally be termed beautiful. Then the smell of otto of rose, the taste of sugar, or the feel of velvet, is beautiful. Thus our New England BRETHREN are thoroughly consistent in the use of this word, when they speak of the taste of good bread, or the sensation produced by a fine day, as beautiful. But true beauty, as distinguished from sensuous agreeableness, is a mental and not a sensuous perception; like the perception of *law* in nature, it is always a *perception of relation.* Let us illustrate by a simple case. We sound a certain note in music. The simple impression of the sound upon the ear, if it be a pure and sweet sound, is *agreeable.* After a while, we sound the third or fifth above it. This, also, produces an agreeable impression. We now sound both notes together, or in rapid succession, so that the mind can *compare* them. A *relation* is at once perceived, which is called *a chord. This is the simplest expression of beauty;* so simple and easy that it seems like a pure sensuous impression. The whole of music consists in the combination of such pleasant relations; becoming higher as the relations are more complex. The same truth may be equally well illustrated by the sense of sight, in the enjoyment of color or form. A single color, as blue, if it be pure and clear, will produce an agreeable impression; so will any other single color—as orange. Now, place these side by side, so that they may be *compared;* instantly there is a mental perception of the relation of these

colors to one another. If this relation is pleasant, it is called harmony, or concord; if unpleasant, discord. The perception of this harmony of colors is, again, the perception of beauty in its simplest expression. The same is true with reference to form. The straight line is not beautiful, although it may produce a pleasant impression on the sense, because the impression is single. But the curved or waving line is beautiful or the contrary, because here we have many impressions of lines in various positions, the *relations* of which to one another may be compared by the mind. If these relations are pleasant, it is called beautiful. From the various combinations of these relations of *color* and *form* arise the whole art of sculpture and painting. In the simple cases we have mentioned, the relation is so simple that it seems almost like a pure sensuous impression; but as the relations become more and more complex, as in actual art, the mental perception recedes farther and farther from the sensuous, and becomes more and more elevated and pure. We said that the perception of pleasant relation is purely mental, and similar to the perception of law in nature. The ancients understood this, and gave most beautiful and significant expression to it, when they called the beautiful arrangement—the harmonious adjustment—in a word, the law of the universe—"*the music of the spheres.*"

It may be asked, why is there not a perception of beauty, and a fine art, connected with the other senses? The reason is very obvious. Sight and hearing are the senses most immediately connected with the mind; they are, by far, the higher senses. Taste and smell are far lower, being connected almost purely with our material nature. But the perception of pleasant relation is purely mental. Therefore the perception of relation, in the case of these sensuous impressions, must be exceedingly imperfect. There *is*, however, a perception of relation (though very imperfect), and a fine art, (but one of a very low order,) connected with sensuous impressions of taste and smell also. Yes,

French cookery and perfumery are fine arts, though of the lowest possible kind; and the term beautiful might be truly applied to a *pleasant combination* of tastes and odors; and, perhaps, even the refining effects of these arts are not to be despised. In all notions embodied in popular language, however, there is a germ of truth when properly understood. The term *beautiful* is popularly applied to agreeable impressions on the sense of sight and hearing, because of the less gross nature of these sensuous impressions, when compared with others; because of the closer alliance between them and the mental perception of true beauty; because we rise by almost insensible gradations from these sensuous impressions to the perception of simple beauty; and from this, again, through imperceptible gradations, to the perception of the highest and most complex beauty. Other sensuous impressions are not called beautiful, because they are not thus connected with the higher forms of true beauty.

There is another theory, that of Alison and Jeffrey, which makes beauty altogether arbitrary, and dependent upon accidental association; a thing of mere fashion, the result of circumstances and education. This is surely an easy way of getting rid of the difficulty and the labor of attempting a true philosophy; a method very common, and characteristic of the present age; characteristic of the trifling, superficial, sceptical, but acute and ingenious philosophy of the beginning of the nineteenth century. Religion, morals, virtue and vice, individual differences of character—every thing most sacred and every thing most degrading in our nature, is treated in the same summary way; it is all fashion, education, circumstances, and the whole subject is dismissed with a shrug of the shoulder. The answer to all this is simple. As circumstances, education, etc., may modify, improve, or degrade, but can not constitute humanity; so, also, education and accidental circumstances may improve or injure the sense of beauty—associations may cluster around and enhance or destroy

our perception of beauty—but can not constitute beauty itself. As there is a true ideal of humanity, amid the infinitely diversified modifications existing in every individual mind, and still more in different races; so there is a true ideal standard of beauty, in spite of diversity of individual, and still more of national standards. This ideal standard of beauty is evidently the image of the ideal humanity. To prove that beauty is not the mere result of accidental association, we have only again to reduce it to its simplest terms, as the perception of harmonious relation of sensuous impressions. The pleasure taken in a simple chord in music, or in the combination of complementary colors, surely can not be reduced to any principle of accidental association. If there is any association in the matter at all, it must be innate and intuitive—connected with the essential nature of man; and if so, beauty is no longer arbitrary.

It is evident, then, that beauty is but another expression for harmonic relation, and the perception of beauty is the perception of harmonic relation. That certain relations are harmonious and pleasant, while others are discordant and unpleasant, is an ultimate fact, incapable of farther analysis, unless we assume (what is almost certain) that there is and must be some inscrutable connexion ("*correspondence*") between harmonic relations in the external world, and that spiritual harmony which constitutes holiness. Beauty is the type of spiritual harmony—of a perfect humanity. Man, in his fallen state, still retains some "*reminiscences*" of a happy state, in which all the powers of his soul and body acted spontaneously and in perfect harmony. Every thing which *suggests* this spiritual and bodily harmony is called beauty. Why certain combinations of sounds, or colors, or forms, should suggest this, is an ultimate fact, no more capable of farther analysis than why vibrations should produce sound or light. A true theory of beauty, therefore, is not to be sought by vain attempts to explain the *essence*

of this sentiment, but by the discovery of its *laws*. These laws constitute the science of æsthetics.

(*b.*) There are two fundamental conditions of material existence, viz., space and time. There are, also, only two senses through which the mind perceives harmonic relations, viz., the eye and the ear. Through the eye we take cognizance of harmonic relations in *space;* through the ear, of harmonic relations in *time*. Now, the comparison of these two organs of sense, as to their power of perceiving* relations, leads to some curious and interesting results, not hitherto noticed by any writer on this subject.

If we take any *single* pure color, and place it before an observer, the eye unhesitatingly determines the color, and the exact shade, with great accuracy. If the same color be placed before the same person many times, or before many different individuals of good eyes and ordinary practice in their use, it will always be perceived as the same thing, and called by the same name. But if, now, we sound a single pure musical note, and ask a listener what note it is, he can not determine with any accuracy whether it is A or B, or C or D, or any other note of the gamut. He may guess, but can not be certain. If the same note be sounded at different times, at long intervals, he will call it some times one note, some times another; and so, also, different persons will, perhaps, disagree as to its exact pitch. Hence, in singing, the absolute necessity of an instrument, or a tuning-fork, to give the pitch. Thus far the eye seems vastly superior to the ear in accuracy of the knowledge which it conveys. Next, let us take any *two* pure colors, as blue and yellow, and lay them one on the other, if the pigments are transparent, or mix them if opaque, (*superpose them in space*). In this case we see no longer either

* To avoid circumlocution, we have adopted this expression, although, as we have already shown, the perception of relation, even the simplest, is a mental process one degree removed from pure sensuous perception.

blue or yellow, but an entirely different color, apparently equally simple and pure, viz., green. The two original colors are both lost in an intermediate color—a sort of *semitone.* But if we take two pure musical notes, and sound them together, (*superpose them in time,*) we do not, in this case, lose the original notes, nor do we get an intermediate resultant, or semitone. On the contrary, we perceive three distinct things; we hear distinctly each of the original notes; and, in addition to these, we perceive, with the utmost mathematical accuracy, the relation, harmonic or otherwise, existing between them. The least variation from perfect harmony is detected, with an accuracy which surpasses any thing else which the human mind can do. This relation of sensuous impressions *superposed,* whether in space or time, we shall call *chordal harmony.* Again, if we take two pure colors, and, instead of superposing them, place them *side by side,* (consecutively in space,) we see each color distinctly, and also, but *indistinctly,* the harmonic relation between them. The exact shade which is necessary to produce perfect harmony, can not be determined with any certainty; different observers will differ in opinion; and when there is a true harmonic relation, the perception of it is not full, and clear, and certain. But, if we sound two musical notes *consecutively,* (*side by side in time,*) the relation, harmonic or otherwise, is perceived with the utmost mathematical accuracy, at all times, and by all persons with normal ears. This relation of sensuous impressions placed, as it were, *side by side,* we shall call *consecutive harmony,* or melody. In all these latter cases, *i. e.,* in the perception of harmony, we find the ear far superior to the eye. The eye perceives *properties* with the utmost accuracy, but *relations* imperfectly. The ear, on the contrary, perceives *properties* very imperfectly, but *relations* with the utmost accuracy. The one would seem to be the organ of the *mind,* the other the organ of the *soul.*

We have spoken thus far only of sound and color. Associated with these, *form* is generally placed, as one of the fundamental sensuous impressions, the relations of which constitute beauty. But form is already a *relation*, and not a simple sensuous impression. The simple sensuous perception is *direction*, or position. The combination of many sensuous impressions of direction into one mental perception, is form. Thus, the expression, *beauty of form*, is philosophically correct; but beauty of color, or sound, is not. Now the ear perceives *direction* very imperfectly, while the eye does so with mathematical accuracy. The relation between directions, or form, the ear is utterly incapable of perceiving, while the eye perceives form with the utmost precision.

In conclusion, then, we may say that there are really only two entirely distinct sensuous impressions—direction and tone. The one belongs to space, the other to time; the one perceived by the eye, the other by the ear. From one comes sculpture, from the other music, the two fundamental bases of art. Color occupies, in fact, a sort of middle ground. It is allied to tone, in that it consists of *vibrations*, and, in fact, may be arranged into an imperfect gamut. It is also allied to direction, inasmuch as it is the necessary *content of form*, and is perceived by the eye. Sensuous impressions, upon which are founded the fabric of art, therefore, when analyzed to the last degree, consist of *direction* and *vibration*. In comparing the eye and ear, with regard to these, we find that, in the ear, the simple *sensuous* perception, whether of *direction* or *vibration*, (tone,) is imperfect, but the perception of *relation* in the case of vibration is wonderfully accurate: while, in the case of the eye, the sensuous impression, whether of direction or of vibration, (color,) is very accurate; but in the perception of relation, its accuracy extends only to the relations of direction, (form,) but not to those of vibration. Again, that the ear, in so far as it is capable of perceiving relation at all, is

capable both of *chordal* and *consecutive* harmony; and that in the highest degree: while the eye is capable of perceiving only consecutive harmony—in the highest degree, in the case of direction, (form,) and imperfectly in the case of vibration (color,)—but is entirely incapable of perceiving chordal harmony.* In a word, perception of relations by the eye seems to be more *extensive*, since it comprehends both the relations of direction and of vibration; but the perception of relation by the ear is more *perfect* and mathematically accurate. The connexion of fine art with the eye is more extensive, but with the ear more intimate. And hence it follows that the branches of art founded upon visual impression, are more complex, and various, and elevated, but, at the same time, far less perfect and reducible to rule; while the branch of art immediately connected with the ear is less complex and extensive, but much more perfectly developed. Thus music and sculpture—the simplest expression of harmony of form and harmony of sound—form the coördinate bases of art; but music is the most fundamental, because the simplest and most perfectly developed.

But it might be objected that, if music is the simplest department of art, how is it that it has been the last in the order of historic development? How is it that, while sculpture culminated among the Greeks, and painting in the fifteenth century of our era, music has only now reached its culmination? We answer, it is not the simplest in the sense of the rudest and most obvious, but is simplest in its scientific principles; simplest in the sense in which mathematics is the simplest of all sciences, as being the most *abstract*, simple, and universal in its principles. And it is for this very reason that it has been latest in development. The law of development of human knowledge is from the

* Unless, indeed, depth in space, with objects one beyond another, may be compared to an imperfect chord, a broken chord in music.

concrete to the abstract, and then back again to the concrete, through the abstract; from popular notions to sciences the most abstract, and then gradually to the rational interpretation of popular knowledge by scientific principles; from the complex to the simple, and back again, through the simple, to the complex; from instinct, downwards to reason, and then again upwards, to interpret all knowledge by reason; from art to science, and back again to art perfected by science. Thus popular knowledge, commencing first with man, (the most complex of all subjects,) and things most immediately connected with man, extended to animals and plants, to inanimate nature, and so downwards until it reached the simplest abstract principles of mathematics. From this point commenced scientific or rational knowledge, and slowly travelled back again up the scale, through physical, organic, and social science. The progress of art has followed the same law. It commenced with sculpture and architecture, as the most *concrete*, and poetry, as the most *complex* of arts, and passed gradually through painting to music, the most abstract and simple. But when the first principles of art are thoroughly understood in music, then there will be a new and complete development of art upon rational principles, in the order of complexity. In the history of art, we are now exactly in the middle ground, between instinct and reason. We are exactly where the Greeks stood in science. This law of human progress is every where detectible, but, like every other law of progress, is most distinct in science, because this is the simplest department of human activity. Thus, by an independent train of thought, are we again led to the same conclusion to which our reasonings in so many previous articles have led us, viz., the transcendent importance of a sound philosophy of science, not only in itself considered, but as a solid basis of philosophy in almost all other departments.

ARTICLE III.

GEOLOGY AND ITS ASSAILANTS.

The progress of the science of geology has at every step been resisted with singular obstinacy and bitterness. The world opposes every new doctrine, on its first promulgation, unwilling to confess its previous ignorance. We are offended when our fixed opinions are rudely disturbed; when we are called upon to admit that we have been proclaiming as truth that which is false. And however unreasonable this may appear, if we confine our attention to the efforts made to destroy doctrines which we believe to be true, it is not unattended by valuable results; for many a false doctrine is thus detected and exposed; while every truth, before it is permitted to take rank among the clearly established and undeniable, has its real character evinced by the scrutiny to which it is subjected, and by the tests applied to it, as it never would have been, had it been suffered to pass unchallenged. But geology, besides undergoing this rigid examination, as a new comer upon the field of truth, has been assailed with unwonted vehemence. From the formation of its first provisional hypothesis, to bind together the few imperfectly known facts, down to the present time, when its leading principles must be looked upon by all who have adequately examined the subject as firmly established, it has been forced to meet and to overcome such violent, and even virulent opposition as has been made to perhaps no other science. The reason of this is, that it has been regarded as the enemy of the Holy Scriptures. These we receive as containing truths, compared with which all others sink into insignificance; and so fully authenticated by the strongest evidence of every kind, that it is impossible for a reasonable mind to doubt them, or to receive as true any

thing that is really inconsistent with them. But instead of causing such unseemly opposition to the progress of knowledge, this faith should rather lead those who are actuated by it to further all inquiries after truth; believing, knowing, that the final result of every investigation will be to strengthen the foundations of natural religion, and to show that entire harmony subsists between every truth thus discovered and all that is taught in the word of life, whenever they relate to the same subject. It is difficult to repress a doubt as to the genuineness and strength of that faith which would check the freest search after truth in the works of God. It must often be the result of weak faith, and a secret dread that, after all, some thing may be found out, that will compel an abandonment of belief in the Bible. But in many cases it would be unjust to attribute this course to a want of faith. There is one other source of suspicion and hatred of scientific discoveries, and apparently but one: it is that while we have undoubting faith in the word of God, we have equal confidence in our ability to interpret it, and are influenced by that intolerance towards all who believe either less or more than ourselves, which is the disgrace of our kind. It is time that this virulent opposition were laid aside, and that we who know the truth of the Bible should act, neither as though we feared every moment that it may be proved to be a mythical collection of questionable traditions, nor in wicked violation of the spirit of forbearance and love taught in its pages.

Geologists have seldom taken any notice of attacks, either upon themselves or upon their science, knowing that the science needs only to be studied to evince its truth to any fair mind; and believing that every effort to convince, by sound reasoning, those who could adopt the prevailing anti-geological hypotheses would be utterly futile; that those who adopt their opinions without reason can not be convinced by reason. Such contemptuous neglect may seem supercilious; and yet it is hardly to be wondered at

or condemned, so wild and absurd are many of the guesses which it would be necessary to controvert. But we think that this silence has, to some extent, been injurious to the cause of truth; for, by many who can not examine for themselves, it has been construed into an acknowledgment of the success of the attacks. Therefore we propose to consider a few of the most plausible objections which have been urged against geology. We design not so much to advance arguments in favor of the truth of the science, as to exhibit, in the present article, the character of the assaults upon it, and to point out some of the mistakes of anti-geologists concerning its nature; and, at some future time, to present specimens of the hypotheses which they would have us receive instead of the established geological theories.

In the war against geology, as in most other wars, there have been many classes of combatants, and it has been waged with various degrees of fairness. A few of the assailants, perhaps, really know what the science is, but have been unable to satisfy themselves of the certainty of its fundamental principle; and have honorably attempted to destroy it, by showing that it has nothing to rest upon. We express ourselves doubtfully here; for while it is possible that this class may exist, we have to confess our ignorance of its actual existence. Another class attack it without professing to know any thing of it, except that it is charged with teaching that which is inconsistent with the Bible. Without waiting to learn whether or not the charge is true, they forthwith do what they can to expel it from the domain of the credible. We have no hesitation in saying that, if this charge could be substantiated, we would at once join this attacking party; believing that the truth of the Bible is established by evidence, external and internal, of such overwhelming strength, that whatever is inconsistent with its ascertained teachings is, by that fact alone, proved

to be untrue; just as we would pronounce that course of reasoning to be untrue, without waiting to hear any part of it, which ended with the assertion that the sum of the angles of a plane triangle is greater or less than two right angles.

Another class, with some knowledge of the subject, but this distorted, because it is imperfect, or because it has been sought not with the desire to reach the truth, but to establish a foregone conclusion, are conspicuous upon the field. Often their arguments are well constructed, of undoubted facts, bound together by undeniable first principles, and would utterly demolish the scientific claims of geology, did these involve the absurdities or depend upon the untruths thus prostrated. But, unfortunately for the conquerors, it is not geology that they have attacked, but some thing else, that they have oddly mistaken for it. The caricature receives a death-blow from the same hand that has brought it into existence, but geology remains unharmed.

But, perhaps, it has happened still oftener in the history of this conflict, that not merely has some thing different from geology been mistaken for it, but the assailing arguments have been even more grotesque than the caricature of geology assailed. For striking illustrations of this, we refer our readers to Art. V., No. 3, Vol. XIII., of this Review. And others we will give as we proceed.

Of the modes of warfare practised, some, as we have intimated, are perfectly honorable; but others, we must say, are just the reverse, unworthy of honest combatants or of a just cause. No one can or does object to the attempt to prove that geology is not a science; that its advocates are in error; that its principles have not yet been, and can not, from the nature of the subject, hereafter be established. If success attend these efforts, great good will have been effected; the cause of truth will have been promoted. If success be unattained, and unattainable, the only painful

consequence will be loss of time and reputation to the mistaken anti-geologist.

It is also quite fair to try to set aside geological principles, by showing that all known facts may be explained quite as satisfactorily, or even more so, by other theories than those advanced by the geologist. This course is attended by consequences of the same kind as in the last case; but hitherto the inconveniences have been more serious in degree; for every effort of this nature has evinced such remarkable ignorance, either of the facts to be accounted for, or of the general physical laws involved in the hypotheses advanced, that all reputation for exact scientific knowledge has been immediately lost to the author, and he has become a laughing-stock to all who are really acquainted with the subject.

Thus far, however, no moral obliquity has been manifested; nothing disgraceful has been done; no poisoned arrows have been employed. But what shall we say of the last mode to be noticed, which, unhappily, is more frequently resorted to than all others? This consists in exciting suspicion and prejudice against the geologist, by raising the hue and cry of "rationalist," "sceptic," "infidel," "atheist." Unable to refute his arguments in an honorable way, he who adopts this plan represents him as systematically laboring to prove that to be false and worthless which the Christian heart prizes above every thing in the world besides. Some times he charges him with open infidelity—with assailing the Bible without disguise; at other times, with consciously desiring to cause the Bible to be rejected as untrue, while he hypocritically professes to be a believer; at other times, with holding such loose views of inspiration, that, although his professions of belief may be sincere, his rationalistic opinions are even more dangerous, if possible, than those of the other classes. Now, that there have been geologists justly liable to these charges, we do not deny; but we protest against the generalization of

the charge; against imputing such antagonism to the Bible, in whole or in part, to geologists as a class. It is untrue; it is unkind; it is unworthy a good cause, especially the cause of Christian truth.

Near akin to this is the practice of representing the contest as one between Christians, and especially ministers, ("parsons," as the clerical writer will some times say, in order to gain the sympathy always freely accorded to the persecuted,) on the one hand, and unclerical and uninformed geologists on the other. All professional expositors of the Sacred Scriptures, whose orthodoxy can be admitted; all sound believers of sufficient knowledge and discrimination to prevent their holding, at the same time, irreconcilable opinions, are anti-geologists; while those whom they oppose are half-learned laymen, who either do not know what the Bible teaches, or do not care. Now, would it not surprise those who have been believing such representations to learn that just the reverse is true? And yet such is the fact. The leading writers on the geological side have, with few exceptions, been ministers of the Gospel, of every denomination, whose profound reverence for the whole Bible as the very word of God, has never been called in question; while the leading anti-geological writers have been laymen; some of whom have taken the most unwarrantable liberties with the sacred text, and have without scruple rejected those parts of it which would not agree with their hypotheses. This is so well known to all acquainted with the literature of the controversy, that that it might seem superfluous to substantiate it by an enumeration of the various authors. But the frequent reiteration of erroneous assertions on this point makes it necessary to give at least a few names.

Let us see, then, among the more prominent writers, who are the self-styled defenders of Bible truth, in the controversy between geology and the Bible, as this strife is incorrectly termed, and who are the infidel geologists.

Among the latter we find the ministry of every branch of the Christian Church well represented. Among the Presbyterians in Scotland, Dr. Chalmers, the champion of the Free Church, maintained so earnestly one geologico-scriptural hypothesis that he is frequently referred to as its author. It is hardly necessary to assert his orthodoxy. The geological works of Dr. David King, of the United Presbyterian Church, and of Dr. J. Anderson, of the Established Church of Scotland, must be generally known. The orthodoxy of these writers is also above suspicion. Of the Independents of England, none are regarded as sounder in the faith than the late Dr. Pye Smith and Dr. Harris. The Congregationalist Dr. Hitchcock, the chief advocate of geological views in New England, is one of the most evangelical divines in that region. And we have yet to hear the charge of rationalism or infidelity, latent or avowed, brought against Professor Sedgwick, Bishop Sumner, and Dean Buckland, of the Established Church of England, except as it is brought against all who do not adopt the peculiar views of anti-geologists. And yet all of these have maintained the infidel geological views! The only very prominent layman among the authors on that side is Hugh Miller; and his orthodoxy was so undoubted that he was chosen the editor of the organ of the Free Church of Scotland.

The chief of those who have gratified their enemies, (if they have any,) by writing books on the other side, are the laymen, David N. and Eleazar Lord, of this continent, who, we doubt not, are sincere believers in the word of God, as they understand it; and Granville Penn and George Fairholme, of Great Britain, who deliberately set aside such parts of the first chapters of Genesis as will not bend to their unscientific notions.

If we turn to the writings of those Romish and Puseyite authors who are characterized by the profoundest reverence for the Holy Scriptures, errorists though they are, we

find the same thing to be true. We need only refer to Dr. Pusey and Cardinal Wiseman, to prove the correctness of this statement. The work of Cardinal Wiseman, on the connexion between Natural Science and Revealed Religion, in which he shows how the principles of geology may be consistent with the biblical record of creation, is justly admired as evincing the most sacred regard for God's word; and, at the same time, a competent knowledge of natural science, united with remarkable philosophic fairness of mind.

When we examine the works of authors who have written in foreign tongues, the very same fact presents itself. The most thoroughly evangelical ministers of the Gospel, the professional expositors of the word of God, who most cordially and unreservedly believe in its plenary inspiration, maintain at once the truth of geological teachings and their harmony with the more precious doctrines of revelation; while many, we believe most, of the principal non-clerical writers, both believers and unbelievers, of all shades, and those who, from their training, may reasonably be expected to be imperfectly acquainted with one side of the subject or the other, deny that it is possible for both the Bible and geology to be true. For full illustration and proof of this, we need only compare the views of the theologians, Kurtz, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, and Delitzsch, with those of the laymen, Wagner, the believer, Bunsen, the rationalist, De Luc, De Serres, down to Vogt, the scoffing disbeliever.

In the selection of the above named authors, we have endeavored to bring forward those who fairly represent all the principal writers on the subjects involved: a full enumeration, we believe, would lead to the same conclusion. Thus is demonstrated the serious (yet, we hope, unintentional) mistake of anti-geologists, who are so fond of classing geologists with infidels, or with those who know little of the Bible and its teachings, or care little for them.* It

* It is true that the names of many ministers might be given who have, in pamphlets, etc., denied the possibility of any agreement between geology

must not be supposed that we regard the point at issue as one which can be settled by vote, or by the authority of the learned and godly Christian ministers to whom we have referred. But we do think that the opinions of such men ought to silence the cry of "infidel," "rationalist," etc., which many are so ready to raise against all who believe the doctrine of the earth's antiquity. We think, too, that we are entitled, as ministers, to no special privileges in our discussions with geologists. If there is a contest, it is not between "parsons" and geologists; and we must not falsely assume, if we attack geology, that we go forth as standard-bearers of the Church against infidelity, or to sustain the doctrines of the Church; when the Church catholic, during the last forty years, has given forth the opinion, as far as can be learned from the writings of its leading spirits, that the Bible no where teaches any thing that is inconsistent with modern geology.

The first mistake of anti-geologists concerning the nature of the science which we will notice is, that they generally suppose it to be cosmogony, or, at least, geogony; a history of the origin or creation of the universe, or, at least, of our earth. Accordingly, if it fail to give a satisfactory account of the creation, to demonstrate in what state matter first appeared, and what were all the successive steps, from the very first, by which the earth assumed its present form and condition, it is held to be worthless, and to have failed in all that it proposed to do. This shows an entire misappre-

---

and the Bible: as the Rev. Mellor Brown, Dr. Dickinson, Prof. Baden Powell, and others; and we would be sorry to deprive such excellent laymen as Dennis Crofton, Dr. R. Poole, Gibson, Pattison, and others, of the credit which they deserve as defenders of the truth of both the Bible and geology. But this does not affect the truth of the assertion, that most of the professional expositors of the Scriptures who have written at length upon the subject, during the last half-century, in every branch of the Christian Church, have believed that the doctrines of geology are in no way inconsistent with those of sacred writ.

hension of its character and its aim. No reasonable geologist has ever claimed this for his science. He regards it as a history of those changes which have distinctly left their record in the earth's crust. Many of these records are now read as easily, and with as much certainty as to their meaning, as state papers in government archives relating to the events of the last century; while others resemble rather the faded and tattered fragments of ancient documents, in almost obsolete tongues, from which we can with the utmost toil learn only the leading characteristics of the ages to which they refer. In tracing the history of any nation towards its origin, we at length reach a point where historical truth begins to be mingled with doubtful traditions; still beyond this, we are either left wholly to conjecture, or are dependent for a few glimpses of possible truth upon fabulous legends. Thus, in Roman history, we gradually pass from the certain, through the period of Curtius's self-sacrificing leap, the divine origin of Romulus and Remus, and their preservation by the she-wolf, to the wanderings of Æneas and Iulus. We trace with considerable confidence the history of Egypt to the time of the great Rameses Miamun, whose predecessors we see with increasing dimness, as far as the looming figure of Menes, beyond which all is lost in the night-gloom of fabulous reigns of gods. So it is in geology. We trace with perfect distinctness the general course of events, through the comparatively recent period of the tertiary, through the stirring times of the secondary, and almost to the beginning of the ancient fossil-bearing primary strata. During this time, it is true, there are many events over which doubt hangs, as in other histories; but this does not affect the truth of what we know. Our knowledge becomes more fragmentary beyond this point, as we penetrate the non-fossiliferous strata, because they are marked with but few characters now legible; nearly all that we understand having been obliterated, if they ever existed. When we reach the unstratified rocks,

we can learn nothing from them, except here and there an isolated fact. Of the changes which these may have previously undergone, we *know* nothing. But just as speculations concerning the possible meaning of the story of Romulus, or the possible basis of fact which Egyptian mythology may have, do not invalidate the truth of succeeding history, so speculations concerning the possible previous condition (if such there was) of the oldest unstratified rocks, do not affect the truth of the account of succeeding events that lie within the geological historic period. Hence the assaults upon the nebular hypothesis, upon the assumption that the earth was at one time a molten globe, and even upon the doctrines of central heat and metamorphism, do not touch geology; and if it could be demonstrated that these conjectures are wholly unphilosophical and untrue, the scientific history of the earth, as presented to us by the geologist, would be no more rendered doubtful than would the history of Julius Cæsar, by proving that he was not descended from Iulus; or the existence of Rome, by proving that Mars was not the father of Romulus, and that a wolf was not his foster-mother.

It will be seen, from these considerations, that the greater part of every anti-geological argument at once tumbles to the ground, as soon as it has been ascertained what geology professes to be. No part of the doctrine of the earth's hoary antiquity rests upon what we may term the mythical period of the earth's history—that antecedent to the formation of the oldest stratified rocks. And the semi-historical period of the non-fossiliferous strata might also be omitted, without at all endangering it.

This limitation of geology to its proper sphere might have been expected to mitigate the violence of its assailants; but when one of its most distinguished founders ventured to disclaim for his science the power of seeing back to the first moment of creation, or of looking forward to the final consummation of all things, saying that he could

"see no traces of a beginning, or indications of a coming end," a reserved guard of anti-geologists denounced him as an infidel, who flatly denied the truth of the biblical account of the creation, and of the predicted end of the world; his modest disclaimer of omniscience concerning the entire history of the earth, was distorted into an atheistic assertion of the eternity of matter. And to this day, the luckless Hutton is the standing illustration of the atheistical tendencies of natural science generally, and especially of geology. The unhappy science is thus placed in this dilemma: if it attempt to go beyond its admitted boundaries, and to approach nearer the mysteries of creation by means of probable conjecture, it is frowned upon as impiously presumptuous, and it is falsely represented as requiring its conjectures to be received as certainties; on the other hand, if it modestly confine itself to rigid reasoning and ascertainable truths, it is angrily driven away as grossly atheistic.

Another mistaken view of the science—quite a favorite with anti-geologists—is, that there is nothing settled in it; that its votaries do not agree on a single important point, except in asserting the antiquity of the earth. The following extracts from Lord's Geognosy will show how this is presented:

"That so mistaken a system should have gained the assent and advocacy of so large a body of studious and talented men, is truly a matter of astonishment. The fact, indeed, that they universally and unhesitatingly concur in assigning a vast period to the formation of the strata, is sometimes alleged as a proof of the validity and amplitude of the evidence on which their judgment is founded. The unanimity and ardor with which they maintain it, and the disquietude, and not unfrequently discourtesy, with which they receive a doubt of its truth, are certainly remarkable. The concurrence, however, is seen to be entitled to but little weight, when it is considered that it is almost absolutely confined to this branch of their speculations;—that there is not another question in the whole range of their system in regard to which they do not entertain a wide diversity of opinion. They are not agreed, for example, whether the world, at its creation, was in a gaseous or in a solid form. They are not agreed in respect

to the process by which granite, gneiss, schist, and the other primary rocks were produced. They are not agreed in respect to the point at which the secondary series commences, the order of the strata, the sources from which some of their elements were drawn, nor the agencies to which they owe their peculiar structure. They differ in respect to the point at which vegetable and animal life commenced, and the forms which it first assumed. They entertain the most diverse and absurd opinions respecting the origin of limestone, coal, gypsum, chalk, magnesia, iron, and salt. They hold conflicting views in regard to the state of the globe at the epoch of the different formations, the forces by which the strata were dislocated, the causes by which the mountains were upthrown, the period at which land animals were first called into existence, and the origin of the races that now inhabit the globe They differ, likewise, to the extent of countless ages, in regard to the period that has elapsed during the formation of the strata. In short, beyond the simple facts, that the strata have been formed since the creation of the earth, that chemical and mechanical forces of some kind were the principal agents in their deposition, and that the fossilized forms that are imbedded in them once belonged to the vegetable and animal worlds, there is scarce a topic of any moment in the whole circle of the science in respect to which they do not maintain very diverse opinions; there is scarce a solitary point so fully ascertained as to be placed beyond doubt."—Pp. 303, 304, 305.

We have selected this, because it is an exhaustive enumeration of the discordant opinions which prevail. It is certainly a formidable one; and with the exception of the clause respecting the "order of the strata," it is correct. But as far as the *historic* period of geology is concerned, these discordances are of little importance. The arguments which are supposed to prove that the earth and its earlier inhabitants were called into being more than ten thousand years ago, are not touched by a single point in the enumeration. We say ten thousand years; for if this period be admitted, it matters little, as regards any imaginary connexion with biblical chronology, whether the time of creation was ten thousand or ten thousand million years ago. If even the numbers six thousand or seven thousand be abandoned, it must be on the ground that the Bible does not fix the time of the creation. Therefore, the only point which, at first sight, seems to bear materially upon the question at issue, does not really affect it; for, after "differ-

ing to the extent of countless ages, in regard to the period that has elapsed during the formation of the strata," all agree that the shortest possible period immeasurably exceeds ten thousand years. The whole argument rests upon "the simple facts that the strata have been formed since the creation of the earth, that chemical and mechanical forces of some kind were the principal agents in their deposition"—forces ascertainable from an examination of the strata and their contents—"and that the fossilized forms that are imbedded in them once belonged to the vegetable and animal worlds." It is not pretended that there is a want of agreement as to these facts; and the chronological question is settled by them. And even the great majority of those who have begun to study them with the sole design of showing that they do not prove the earth's antiquity, have soon become convinced of that which they set out to overthrow.

We have already said that the diversity of opinion among geologists is of little importance. It no more weakens the confidence due to the science as a whole, than the differences among British historians make us doubt the principal facts of British history. And yet, what a startling list of discordant views and statements might be given! They are not agreed, for example, whether Great Britain, when first visited by man, was an island or a part of the continent of Europe. They are not agreed in respect to the origin of the races by which it was first peopled. They are not agreed in respect to the time when the Cymry obtained possession of the island; whether their settlement was opposed by wild beasts or human beings; or when their power was finally broken, and they were forced to yield to the Teuton, They entertain the most diverse and absurd opinions respecting the origin and design of the so-called runic inscriptions, the remarkable circles of stones near Stonehenge and elsewhere, assigning them to the Phœnicians, the British Druids, and to the Romans.

They differ in respect to the point at which parliaments began to assemble, and the forms and powers which they at first assumed. They hold conflicting views in regard to the social condition of the people at different epochs, the moral forces by which society was convulsed, and even in regard to the causes of the last revolution—whether they were political or religious. They differ, likewise, to the extent of many centuries, in regard to the period when the Phœnicians first visited their shores. And so the enumeration might proceed indefinitely. But who regards British history as rendered thereby so uncertain that it would be unsafe to say that the Celts, the Saxons, and the Romans successively governed the island, and that it has certainly been inhabited for not less than two thousand years? Of no greater weight are the objections urged against geology from this source.

We might here leave this objection, were it not for the deep impression which it has made upon the popular mind; from the incessant reiteration of the assertion that there is nothing settled in geology, and of the advice to wait until it has settled itself before an effort shall be made to settle its relations to revealed truth. Even if there were serious differences among geologists—which, as we have seen, is not the case in respect to the question at issue—it would be unwise to conclude that the subject is worthy of no consideration on the part of sensible men, until these differences are adjusted. This principle would prevent our giving our attention to any subject whatever, or believing any thing whatever, except, perhaps, our own existence. We could not believe in the existence of a material world; how often has its existence been denied by learned philosophers! We must refuse our assent to the truths of mathematics, astronomy, optics, chemistry, electricity: to what must we not refuse it? Mathematicians are not agreed even as to the definition of a straight line. Astronomers hold the most conflicting views respecting the nebulæ, double stars,

the nature and orbits of comets, the origin of meteors, and the condition of interastral space. Philosophers have wrangled without ceasing over the questions, whether light is material substance, or the effect of mere motion; whether the so-called elements are simple substances, or compounds; whether matter is infinitely divisible or composed of atoms; whether the phænomena of electricity are due to one fluid, two fluids, or none. But who, for this reason, says that he will wait until they are settled, and then he will listen to the conclusions reached? Before deciding that it would be wise to avow or advise such a determination, it would be well to observe the force with which the principle might be turned against us, when we are seeking to win the attention of unbelievers to our holy religion. Scarcely any objection to pure and scriptural Christianity is oftener upon the lips of its opponents. The work of the eloquent Bossuet, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, ought to be regarded as conclusive against protestantism, if such a principle satisfy us. And how shall we answer, when we are called upon to state what one point in the Christian system is settled? To what extent is the book containing its principles to be received as true? Is it alone sufficient to reveal to us the whole will of God, or do we need the traditions of the Church besides? Does it teach that God exists in one person, or in three? What was the design of Christ's death? What is taught as to the future state of the wicked? What is the scriptural system of Church government? And so the objector proceeds. Let the advocates of Christianity, says he, settle among themselves what their principles are, and then it will be time enough for us to look into the matter. If we condemn such cavils as weak and foolish, in this case, let us not expose ourselves to similar condemnation. We can not heed the advice to wait until there shall be no cavillers. And if we proclaim the untruth of geology, let it be after a candid examination of the evidence by which it is supported, and not because

we have found that there are differences among its votaries, on some points on the outskirts of the science.

In the next place, the combined influence of preconceived opinions and imperfect knowledge on the part of anti-geologists, is strikingly exemplified by their misconception of arguments in the proper domain of geology. It is not that they have not examined the subject; but that they have examined it with the predetermination to find nothing but absurdities and contradictions. An admirer and intimate friend of the most prominent anti-geological writer in America once said to us, when an apparent want of knowledge was attributed to him, "He has studied more works on geology than any man in this country; I know he has read a pile that would more than reach from the floor to the ceiling of this room." To what purpose all this reading and study have been, let one example show. Geologists hold that the materials of which the stratified rocks are composed were derived from the disintegration of previously existing rocks. On this doctrine, this author remarks:

"The strata of the earth are held by geologists to be, on an average, about ten miles in depth. To maintain, therefore, that their materials were derived from continents and mountains of granite, and were borne from them by torrents and rivers to the ocean, is to imply that these granite continents and mountains, even if they covered as large an area as the strata now occupy, were at least ten miles above the level of the ocean; and if the mountains from which it is represented the matter of the strata was chiefly drawn, were of but half or two-thirds the extent of the strata that are supposed to have been formed from them, then they must have been elevated at least fourteen or fifteen miles above the level of the ocean. But mountains elevated to such an enormous height, and extending over vast areas, could never have been disintegrated by the action of the air, water, and heat. There would have been no air, except of the most attenuated kind, and no water at all, probably, at such an elevation. On the supposition that vapors could have ascended to such a height, and fallen in the form of snow, they would for ever have remained congealed. No heat could have been developed there sufficient to dissolve them. No rivers, therefore, could have flown from them, and consequently no

detritus could have been borne from them to the sea, to be distributed over its bottom, and form layers like our present strata."—Lord's Geognosy, pp. 21, 22.

Now, in the first place, no geologist holds that "the strata of the earth are, *on an average*, about ten miles in depth." They do hold it as an indisputable truth, that the combined thickness of overlapping strata, which have certainly been formed successively, is ten miles or more; but not that all the strata making up this thickness occur in any one place, much less in every place. It is clear, from a consideration of the manner in which the strata were formed—by deposition from water—that they could not have been formed simultaneously over every part of the earth; and further, many strata and parts of strata have been removed by denudation. In the next place, these continents ten miles high, and these mountains fourteen or fifteen miles high, where there could be no air and no water, are required by no geological theory, but exist only in the imagination of the anti-geologist. Daily observation teaches us that the surface of the earth does not stand at a fixed level, but, on the contrary, that it is sinking here and rising there. And the absurd hypothesis of the geologist is, that changes like those in progress now have always been going on; and that as at present, so during the past, detrital matter has been conveyed from such parts of the earth as have been for the time elevated, to such as for the time have been depressed. Thus does this anti-geologist, after all his study, show how ignorant he is of the most familiar principles and facts of the science he would overturn.

Such misconceptions of geological reasoning are not confined to this writer. Illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely; but we will content ourselves with only one more. Many efforts have been made to estimate approximately the length of time necessary for the excavation of the gorge below the falls of Niagara, and for the formation of the

delta of the Mississippi, two of the most recent events in geological history. Lyell, after pointing out the great difficulties in the way of reaching any trustworthy result, conjectures that perhaps thirty-five thousand years may have been required for the former, and one hundred thousand or more for the latter. Now, anti-geologists have spent much labor in repeating the statements of geologists, that the data on which these calculations are based are not perfectly determined or determinable; and not unfrequently they point out additional grounds of doubt, which are somewhat amusing. They have intimated, for example, that the transporting power of the Mississippi is usually greatly underrated, inasmuch as the water near the rough, uneven bottom of the channel, flows more rapidly than that near the surface. It is to no purpose to refer to the principle in hydraulics, that the velocity varies inversely as the friction, and therefore that the velocity must be greatest near the surface; for, in this discussion, the opinions of illiterate boatmen, who have no means whatever of testing the accuracy of their impressions, are always preferred to the most careful measurements of engineers and men of science, and even to a well-established law in physics. When, by these means, it has been shown that such calculations, confessedly only conjectural, can not determine the exact number of years required by a given series of events, it is maintained that the worthlessness of all geological reasoning concerning time has been demonstrated. It is forgotten or unknown that the geological argument is cumulative; and that it might be admitted that, instead of one hundred thousand, or thirty-five thousand years, only one thousand or less may have been occupied with these events; and yet that the proof remains irresistible that the time required for these, together with other events necessarily anterior to them, was ten thousand years or more.

It is some times assumed that if men of acknowledged ability, and of well-trained reasoning powers, fall into such

palpable errors, after much study of the subject, the fault must be in the subject; it can not possess the scientific character claimed for it. There might be some weight in this objection, if it were true that *classes* of educated men, after due examination, fail to comprehend the principles of geology, and to acknowledge the validity of the evidence by which they are sustained; but this has not been asserted of any class except that of ministers; and we think we have shown that it is not true of it. We hope we have effectually freed the class to which we belong from this aspersion upon its intelligence and its ability to reason. That there are individuals of this and other classes who reject the teachings of geology—individuals, too, of the highest attainments, and whose judgment we value most highly in other directions—is admitted. We do not profess to explain these cases, except so far as they can be fairly referred to the influence of a predetermination to reach a certain conclusion, whatever facts may oppose; and we do not feel called upon to explain them, any more than to say why it is that many intelligent, honest, and learned men, who have spent their lives in studying church government, prefer prelacy or independency to presbytery; or why even honest and learned men, of confessedly high logical powers, prefer popery to protestantism. The difficulty is certainly not in the science; for the labors of modern geologists have so simplified it, and have placed the evidence of its leading principles in so clear a light, that in order to acquire a knowledge of it, no very great amount of study is needed. It has not yet reached that degree of simplicity that its principles, and the evidence on which they rest, can be fully presented in an evening lecture, any more than a course of Christian theology, and the evidences on which it rests, can be similarly compressed. But it has reached such order and simplicity that it is with propriety included among the subjects of study in all our higher seminaries of learn-

ing. That, unlike all other sciences, it will ever be able to force conviction upon the unwilling mind, can hardly be expected. This has been done, and can be done, by no system of truth, not even by Christianity itself.

ARTICLE IV.

RELIGION AND POLITICS.

That religion and politics should be separated, the one wholly divorced from the other, is a popular fallacy so assiduously cultivated by a certain interested party, and so widely disseminated, that it may be justly termed one of Lord Bacon's "idols;" that is, an erroneous impression universally received as a self-evident proposition, without investigation or contradiction. Of the many popular fallacies that are generally afloat in society, there is perhaps none that is deeper rooted or more damaging in its effects than the one just stated. How it originated, and became so deeply implanted in the popular mind, it may be rather difficult to explain. It is, however, a modern notion. The records of the past do not recognize that absolute divorcement between religion and politics required by the fallacy in question; not certainly in Adam's immediate family, until the wicked Cain drew off and set up for himself; not in the family of Noah; not in that of Abraham, or his descendants; or even amongst the ancient pagans. Priests and kings were at first identical. The father was both priest and king of his family. The Roman Emperor was at the same time the Pontifex Maximus. The fact is,

the separation of religion and politics, as a cardinal maxim in the foundation and superstructure of civil society, is of recent growth, the birth of modern infidelity.

Here, perhaps, we shall be met with the objection, at first blush potent and irrefragable, that Christ and his apostles taught that "His kingdom is not of this world." True; but at the same time they taught, with equal explicitness, that the "kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of the Lord." Christ's kingdom is not of this world, because the world has apostatized and become anti-Christ. And the design of His kingdom is to bring it back to its lawful and divine allegiance. Nothing is more clearly and repeatedly announced by Christ and his apostles, than that Christ's kingdom is *aggressive*, and will be satisfied with nothing less than the conquest and subjugation of the whole world. The clear and manifest idea, therefore, contained in the declaration that "Christ's kingdom is not of this world," is, not that Christianity takes no interest in, and exerts no influence over the civil and political well-being of its followers and professors, but that the principles that govern Christ's kingdom are not to be confounded with, nor conformed to the principles that govern a wicked and apostatized world. The notion, therefore, that religion and politics should have nothing to do with one another, is of recent date; the birth, doubtless, of that monstrous triumph of infidelity and atheism developed in the French revolution, when priests and high church dignitaries were forced to renounce Christianity, in order to save their lives.

Again, this injurious error has been artfully and insidiously instilled into the popular mind, under the odious names of "priest-craft," of "jesuitism," of the "union of Church and State," etc.; names and epithets which, in this country at least, carry with them the ideas of hypocrisy, ambition, avarice, and spiritual despotism. But the union of Church and State is a very different thing from the union of religion and politics, as we shall see in the sequel.

In the next place, and more especially, this error has grown in the popular mind from the fact that, owing to an inexcusable negligence, if not a criminal indifference, on the part of religious people, political power has been allowed to slip, for the most part, into the hands of wicked men. This, we are aware, is a bold assertion, and perhaps may be deemed by some imprudent and rash; and did we not know it to be true, we should not venture it. It is true, that amongst the governors, legislators, and politicians of the land, there are a few noble exceptions—men of piety, and of prayer, and of great moral worth; (what would our state and national assemblies be without such salt?) ornaments in the house of God, as well as in the councils of State. But the sad part of it is, that they are the rare exceptions, and not the rule! Who does not know (we challenge contradiction) that, taking our rulers and politicians as a body, they are not godly, but godless men?—that some are blasphemers, some are gamblers, some are drunkards, some adulterers, some sabbath-breakers, and alas! some are all these characters in one? Who would not, in these days, be laughed to scorn, who should require, as a *sine qua non* in a candidate for office, that he be a good man, a man of prayer, "trusting in the Lord with all his heart, and leaning not unto his own understanding"? Every intelligent reader knows what is here affirmed to be true. No wonder, therefore, that unreflecting people should conclude that there is no natural connexion between religion and politics, when the majority of our rulers, and the character of our legislative bodies, is a practical demonstration of the fact. And alas! no wonder that the decided *tendency* of legislation, in many parts of the land, should be to overthrow Christianity, by undermining its principles, setting at naught its precepts, degrading its ministers, and thwarting its benevolent and charitable designs.

This is evinced, in the first place, in the enactment, by our national assemblies, of such laws as set aside the

obligations and sanctity of the Sabbath day; laws which require a very large number of government officials—all connected with the post-offices and the transmission of the mails—to violate the fourth commandment of the decalogue, and therefore indirectly exclude from that important department of the public service, where more, perhaps, than in any other, the influence of an enlightened and tender conscience is needed, all who endeavor consistently and conscientiously to live up to the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion.

This anti-Christian tendency is apparent, in the next place, in the enactment, in some States, of such laws as, in open defiance of the often repeated utterances of the Bible, abolish capital punishment—a device by which the murderer is protected, to the detriment of society.

Again, the same infidel spirit is manifested in some sections of the country, and especially in some of the southwestern States, by such legislation as interferes with and perverts that holy and divine institution, established by the Creator himself, in the garden of Eden, on the morning of man's creation, MARRIAGE between man and woman, constituting them "one flesh," in indissoluble bonds. Marriage is not a human, but a divine institution, as sacred and as intimate as that existing between Christ and his Church, which is his "bride." And yet, the laws of the land, in some parts of the country, degrade it virtually into a copartnership relation, entered into from prudential and economical considerations, just as any other business relation or political alliance is formed, with separate, and often antagonistic rights; and which relation may be, like other copartnership concerns, dissolved almost at will. We do not now refer to such legislation as ignores entirely the very existence of the marriage relation, as well as the parental, amongst a large class of human beings in our midst; but to those laws known in common parlance as "Woman's laws;" laws designed, it would seem, for the express pur-

pose of encouraging vice, villainy, and imbecility, on the part of the husband, by taking away all incentives to honor and high-toned responsibility in maintaining his wife in a condition at least equal to that which she enjoyed when she became his wife, and enabling him to run his career of dissipation and recklessness, without endangering her pecuniary interests. Nay, more, it is a device by which he can, with the appearance of wealth, swindle his neighbor, and then shield himself from the consequences of such villainy behind the ægis of the "Woman's law."

Such legislation brutalizes the holy estate of wedlock, perverts its true intent, violates its nature, and blasts many of its sweetest enjoyments. In many instances, it transforms it from an Eden of bliss, as it was designed by the beneficent Creator, to a bed of brambles and a home of discord. Man is the natural lord and protector of the woman; so proclaimed by the laws of nature, as well as the ordinances of revealed religion. Woman, according to the laws of God, is the complement of the man, and her temporal being is merged into his. Whatever, therefore, degrades the man, of necessity degrades the woman. Whatever disparages the father's authority, as the head of the family, injures the children. Whatever tends to make a man effeminate, or a woman masculine, degrades both. This is effectually accomplished by the "Woman's laws." It takes the crown from the head of the man, and places it upon that of the woman. The woman becomes the protector, and man the protected. He eats at her table, is clothed with her bounty, rides in her carriage, and has a life interest in her estate, in consideration of his being the *overseer* of her property. She can even sue him at law, and recover damages for mismanagement or malfeasance. Is it possible to conceive of any thing more unnatural, humiliating, and degrading than such a perversion? If there be upon the face of the earth one object more contemptible and disgusting than any other, it is this reversing of the

sexes, when the husband and the father lives by the sufferance of wife. But our object at this time and place is not to depict the evil consequences of the "Woman's law," but to allude to them as an illustration of the anti-biblical legislation of certain portions of the country.

Still further, and more insidiously, this bitter antagonism against Christianity, as developed in legislation, is illustrated by disfranchising ministers of the Gospel; depriving them of some of their political rights. This is done in several of the States, by such constitutional enactments as disqualify and prohibit ministers of the Gospel from occupying posts of honor and trust in the councils and executive department of the State. The question is not whether the "ambassadors of Christ," whose proper business it is to preach the Gospel, should come down from their high vocation, and become mixed up with party politics. The impropriety of this we shall discuss fully in the sequel. But the question is simply whether ministers of the Gospel have the *right* to participate in the making and the administering of the laws of the land, provided their fellow-citizens see fit to elect them for that purpose? In some of the States this right is wrested from them, and the dangerous precedent is established of depriving by legal enactments a certain portion of the free citizens of the land of their political rights, on account of their chosen and lawful profession. We term this a *dangerous* precedent; for if a party, or a faction in power, may deprive ministers of the Gospel of their political rights, another party or faction in power may, in like manner, and with like authority, disfranchise physicians, or lawyers, or planters, or printers, or merchants, or mechanics. The principle is the same in both instances. It is plain, therefore, that reason and justice have not guided in such despotic enactments, but feeling, hatred to religion itself. Who can not see that such legislation is a deadly thrust at the very vitals of Christianity? A minister of the Gospel is made an alien; nay,

more, he is reduced to the same level, so far as his political rights are concerned, with the felon, the traitor, the convict, who has forfeited his rights by being convicted of crime! Those who stood around the cross of Christ, and wagged their heads, crying "Crucify him, crucify him," did not manifest a more vindictive and anti-Christian spirit than is manifested by such despotic legislation. To blaspheme, to break the Sabbath, to drink liquor, to gamble, to commit adultery, to lie, to swindle, does not disqualify a citizen for a seat in the legislature of the State; but to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ does! Is it possible to conceive of any thing more inconsistent with the declared principles of our republican government, unjust, tyrannical, and cruel, than such a barefaced assault upon the Christian religion, in the persons of its ministers. Is it, or ought it to be, praiseworthy to occupy posts of honor and trust in the government of the land; and does not that legislation which disqualifies a minister of the Gospel for occupying such posts, *degrade* him? And is not its natural tendency to deter high-toned young men of talents and moral worth from taking into serious consideration their duty to enter the ministry, if they are to be proscribed by the State for so doing? Has not every free-born citizen civil and political rights, and is it not his privilege, according to the principles of our national government, to participate in those State councils where those rights and immunities are protected and defended? And are not ministers of the Gospel free, and equal with others? And have they not property, and families, and rights, to be defended and protected, as well as others? Are they not liable to taxation, and amenable to the laws of the land, and shall they be excluded by law from all participation in the ordaining and regulating of those laws by which they and their families are taxed and governed? The great cardinal principle which was the corner-stone upon which the fair fabric of our once glorious government was reared, and for the maintenance of which

our fathers fought, and bled, and died, was that we should *not* be taxed and ruled without the right to participate in the taxing and ruling power. And yet ministers of the Gospel, and only they, of all the professions and avocations in life, are, in certain States, taxed and ruled, and held amenable to the laws, while, at the same time, their right to take part in the enactment and the execution of those laws is wrested from them! Is it not in the highest degree unjust, therefore, to say nothing of its inconsistency with the principles of a free government, to single them out from every other calling and pursuit in life, and place them in the same category, so far as these political rights are concerned, with felons, convicts, and slaves?

How perfectly sickening it is to listen to the silly pretexts and subterfuges by which the authors and advocates of such legislation attempt to disguise their real motives and impious designs. "Ministers of the Gospel," says one, "ought not to turn aside from their holy avocation, and become mixed up with secular politics, since they by so doing diminish their ghostly influence, and bring reproach upon their sacred calling," etc. Admit it: but because a few mis-named ministers of the Gospel are unfaithful to their sacred trust, or rather have mistaken their proper calling, is that any just reason why the whole profession should be disfranchised, proscribed, and stigmatized? If other professions, the legal, the medical, the mercantile, etc., should be held responsible for the inconsistency and misconduct of some of their members, and proscribed in like manner, we apprehend that we would have to look exclusively to the idle and loafing class who have no profession for our legislators and rulers! But why stop short with prohibiting ministers of the Gospel from engaging in politics and legislation? Why do not these zealots for the consistency and immaculateness of the clergy, pass laws prohibiting them from engaging in other secular pursuits, equally damaging to their clerical standing and ghostly influence,

such as trading, speculating, swapping horses, writing novels, etc.? If they have the right to prohibit ministers of the Gospel from participating in one kind of secular pursuits, they have in another. Why, therefore, do these self-constituted censors of the clergy restrict the prohibition to politics? Is it because politics are more contaminating than all other secular pursuits? This surely does not imply much in favor of the virtue and moral integrity of politicians. The fact is, when we take into consideration the source from which this pretended zeal for the purity of the clerical profession emanates—the moral character of the men, for the most part, by whom ministers of the Gospel are disfranchised of their political rights—the plea in question sounds precisely like "Satan reproving sin!" It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that such tyrannical legislation proceeds, not from a zeal for the honor of religion, but from hatred to Christianity, and a jealousy of its ministers.

To regulate the moral character and ecclesiastical standing of ministers of the Gospel, is a matter that belongs not to the State, but to the Church—not to legislative assemblies, but to ecclesiastical courts. If the State may look after the standing of the ministers of the Gospel, as such, they may, with the same propriety, look after their faith and their ecclesiastical polity, which is an interference with the liberty of conscience; it is the virtual union of Church and State; it is undisguised Erastianism, since the legislature has just as much power, in religious matters, to say you shall, as to say, you shall not, and to inflict *positive* as well as *negative* penalties; they have just as much right to say, you shall not preach without gown and bands, as to say, you shall not have a seat in the legislature. In this particular, therefore, the legislature sets itself up to be the head of the Church, and the expounder of Christian duty.

Another attempts to justify this legislative discrimination against the civil and political rights of ministers of the

Gospel, by the plea, that "ministers are at the same time *exempted* from the performance of certain civil and military duties, such as working on the public highways, sitting on juries, and rendering military service." True, ministers, being *public* servants, are exempted in these particulars, not as a favor to them, but because the performance of such duties would often interfere with the faithful discharge of their own proper functions as public servants, such as visiting the sick, burying the dead, comforting the distressed, and attending to the moral and spiritual wants of the people. This plea might, at first blush, possess some speciousness, if other classes and professions were not also exempted from the rendering of the same services from like considerations. The physician, the judge, the district attorney, the court clerks, and other county and state officers are all exempted. Why not, therefore, for the same reason, deprive them, as well as ministers, of a portion of their political rights, by excluding them from posts of honor and trust in the legislative and executive departments of State? If there were the slightest force in the specious plea, it would be as applicable to the one profession as the other.

But still another frankly avows, that he has no use for rude and ignorant talking parsons in legislative bodies; that such, by their priestly influence at home, bring about their own election, and then consume the time of the legislature in everlastingly talking about matters that they do not understand; therefore, he is in favor of getting rid of such annoyance by constitutional bars and restraints. This is commendable candor, to say the least of it, for which we have far more respect, than for the hypocritical pretexts and subterfuges which we have already exposed. But, whilst we respect the candor of the plea, we have infinite contempt for its logic. In the first place, what reason or justice is there in placing a ban upon a whole profession, distinguished for its talent, learning, piety, and great moral worth, simply because an unworthy member of it, once in

a while, happens to get into the legislature? Why disfranchise such men as the great Dr. John Witherspoon and Dr. James Wilson, the brightest ornaments of the Continental Congress, because now and then a "babbling parson" outtalks a babbling pettifogger, and is elected by a free people to represent them in the legislature? Nay, why not discriminate against the babbling pettifogger, as well as against the babbling parson? Why not also exclude the babbling gambler, and drunkard, and demagogue, irrespective of class or profession? A legislative body has just as much right to exclude one as the other. Why, then, discriminate only against the clerical order? It is not only unjust in fact, but it is utterly inconsistent with, nay, subversive of the cardinal principles of a free government; since it would be very easy to show that the pushing of the practice complained of would soon result in the overthrow of a republican government, and in the establishment, first of an oligarchy, and next of an iron despotism. It is clearly manifest, therefore, that all these pleas in extenuation of the disfranchisement of ministers of the Gospel, as is characteristic of the constitutions of many of the States, resolve themselves into a secret antipathy to religion itself, and a covert design to sap the foundations of Christianity, by stigmatizing and degrading its ministers.

This tendency in legislation is further manifest in some States, (Mississippi, for example,) by such enactments as blast the fruits, and thwart the benevolent designs of Christianity. If we blast the choice fruits of a tree, what use shall we have for the tree itself—"why cumbereth it the ground?" The great and distinguishing feature of Christianity is *charity*, benevolence, "good will to men." Destroy this characteristic of the Christian religion, and you rob it of its chief glory; you efface from it the lineaments of its divine author. This is actually done by the existing laws of Mississippi, (Revised Code, page 302,) where it is made contrary to law for a dying Christian to

"will, devise, or bequeath," one dollar to any Christian charity whatsoever! The statute aforesaid is drawn up with consummate adroitness, so as to defeat the possibility of the dying Christian leaving any thing for the advancement of the Christian religion amongst men. Take, for illustration, the following as a sample of the manner in which the law in question is skilfully and elaborately framed. After guarding most carefully against the possibility of allowing any real estate being left by will for charitable purposes, the law proceeds: "Every legacy, gift, or bequest of money or personal property, or of any interest, benefit, or use therein, contained in any last will and testament, or codicil, in favor of any religious or ecclesiastical corporation, sole or aggregate, or any religious or ecclesiastical society, or to any religious denomination or association, either for its own use or benefit, or for the purpose of being given or appropriated to charitable uses, shall be null and void, and the distributees shall take the same, as though no such testamentary disposition had been made."

Yes, an infidel may leave by will as much as his hatred to religion dictates, for the publication and circulation of the blasphemies of Tom Paine; but the benevolent Christian can not leave a dollar to publish and circulate the Bible, or a religious tract! An Atheist may leave his entire estate to establish an infidel college, to corrupt the minds of youths, and poison the fountains of all genuine morality; but one actuated by Christian benevolence dare not leave a farthing to establish schools and institutions of learning under the influence of religious societies, and the Gospel of Christ! If there be any more effectual way of destroying Christianity, and banishing it from the land, we do not know what it is.

The only plea urged in justification of this odious law is, that "men ought to give in their life-time." True, men ought to give in their life-time, and all their life long, as God prospers them; but how often is it the case that it is

impossible to give all that they wish to give until life is ended. Here, for example, is an old man living on the interest of twenty thousand dollars. He can not give away that capital during his life-time, for that would reduce him to beggary. His great desire is, that this fund, at his death, may go to establish a professorship in a theological seminary, or to educate poor young men for the ministry, or to sustain self-sacrificing missionaries who are toiling to Christianize and civilize our frontier borders; but in the State of Mississippi this can not be done! The business of another man is such, that he can not withdraw from it the capital necessary to its successful continuance, nor can he know, it may be, what will be the residue of his estate until the business of the firm is wound up; yet, in the State of Mississippi, he dare not make any religious charity his residuary legatee! It is not necessary to discuss any further this anti-Christian enactment. It is highly unjust and discreditable, in whatever aspect it may be viewed. It is not only contrary to the spirit, but to the example, set us in the Bible. Did not David leave by will the magnificent legacy out of the proceeds of which the great temple of God was built? Were not the vast majority of all the charitable institutions of Christendom founded in the same way?

It has been shrewdly intimated, in order to reconcile protestant denominations to this insidious encroachment upon their dearest rights—the rights of conscience—that the "Religious Law" was aimed against the Roman Catholics! This is simply ridiculous, since the adherents of the Romish faith are, where the law exists, in an exceedingly small minority, in comparison with the entire population of the State; and it is perfectly certain that, from the force of circumstances, they will never increase in the State to any great extent. But this flimsy subterfuge does not help the matter in the least; it only makes it worse. It would imply that the authors of such proscriptive enactments were impelled by a low, narrow bigotry, as hostile to the princi-

ples of freedom as it is to the liberty of conscience. Is it not one of the great and distinguishing principles of our boasted government, that "the liberty of conscience" shall not be interfered with? And is it not another cardinal principle of republican liberty, that no sect of Christians shall be proscribed for their faith? Consequently, if this law was secretly aimed, as pretended, against the Catholics, then it is anti-republican and despotic. But if it was levelled against all Christians alike, which is the true state of the case, then it violates the great principle of the liberty of conscience; and not only liberty of conscience, but liberty of judgment, civil liberty itself; for has not a man a right to do as he pleases with his own honestly earned money, provided he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbor?

That which lay at the foundation of the ordaining of this odious law, the secret and impelling motive to its enactment and adoption, was the presumption, not that Christians would, of their own accord, bequeath too liberally of their goods for purposes of Christian benevolence, but that ministers of the Gospel would avail themselves of the influence which they might acquire over the minds of men *in extremis*, to induce them to *devote* an undue proportion of their estate for the benefit of the church and clergy. What is this but a covert stab at the character and moral influence of ministers of the Gospel? It is based on the presumption, either that they are not honest men, or that they are fanatics—that they are either knaves or fools! Its tendency, therefore, is to destroy confidence in the ministers of religion, than which there is not a more effectual way to dethrone Christianity in the minds of the people.

We have thus, at some length, illustrated the anti-Christian *tendency* of the legislation of different portions of our country, as a proof of the irreligious character of many of our rulers and law-makers. It is no marvel, therefore, in view of the foregoing facts and considerations, that unre-

flecting people should conclude that there was no natural connexion between religion and politics, whilst the moral character and work of so many of our politicians is a practical demonstration of the same.

Having now explained, in part, the origin of the popular fallacy that religion and politics should be divorced, the one having nothing to do with the other, we shall next proceed to show its falsity, and point out the injurious and dangerous results to which it legitimately leads.

It takes it for granted that man's true temporal interests and his eternal welfare are incongruous, or rather, that they are diametrically opposed; whereas, in truth, they are, in a certain sense, identical. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Politics are to religion what the body is to the soul. A sound body is essential to the facile and successful operations of a sound mind. There is an intimate relation between them. The health of the one is essential to the health of the other; and the disease of the one operates injuriously upon the other. Hence the interests of the one are, to a certain extent, the interests of the other. The same is true in relation to religion and politics. The one is, as it were, the soul, the other the body. Religion is the spiritual, and society the physical part of the State. So that there would be as much propriety in putting asunder the interests of the soul and body of an individual, as religion and politics in a State. The supposition that man's temporal and eternal interests are antagonistic, takes it for granted that man's nature is not in harmony with itself; that his constitution combines rival interests and adverse claims; that what is for the advantage of the body, that is, his personal welfare in his business and social relations, is to the disadvantage of the soul; and that man, as a whole, is composed of discordant, jarring elements; than which nothing can be farther from the truth, or more de-

rogatory to the goodness and wisdom of the Creator. On the contrary, God, in His beneficence, has so constituted man, and so circumstanced him in this world, that all his true interests, both temporal and eternal, run parallel one with the other; or rather flow in the same channel. There is not one interest pertaining exclusively to time, and another exclusively to eternity; but they are, if not identical, yet inseparable. "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things," (viz., true temporal interests,) "shall be added unto you." Time is no other than the beginning of eternity, as childhood is the beginning of life. As, therefore, we can not separate the true interests of childhood from those of mature life, no more can we separate the interests of this life from that which is to come. Eternity is time drawn out. If these views be correct, then it will be impossible to divorce religion and politics, except on the supposition that the latter (so called) do not contribute to the true interests of humanity. If by politics we are to understand that system of arts and devices—that chicanery and machination by which usurpers overthrow the liberties of the people—by which despots maintain their iron grasp upon the necks of their victims—by which tyrants absorb the blood and substance of their slaves—by which a corrupt party keeps in power, and fattens upon the government spoils—by which a faction swells its numbers and increases its power—and by which an ambitious and unprincipled demagogue blinds the people, seduces them from their own true interests, and inspires them with *furor* in favor of a party, irrespective of patriotic principles—if *this* be what is meant by politics, then, of course, true religion can have no fellowship whatever with it, any more than "righteousness with unrighteousness," or than "light with darkness," or than "Christ with Belial." But whilst we are constrained to admit that this is a fair description of what the world calls politics, yet it is a misnomer in fact, and deserves not so honorable an

appellation. The science of politics, properly so called, defines the theory and practice of legally controlling the business pursuits and social relations of society, so as to develope humanity as God made it; and consequently to produce the greatest amount of general well-being. When, therefore, we take into consideration the true nature of man as a physical, moral, intellectual, and religious being, it would be difficult to separate true religion and true politics, since the domain of each trenches upon the other; nay, they are, in a certain sense, almost identical, except that religion is more comprehensive than politics, the greater including the less. The moral law is the foundation of religion; the second table of the moral law, the foundation of politics. Politics are concerned about human relations; religion, about both divine and human. Politics look after the body; religion, after both soul and body. Politics inculcate love to our neighbor; religion, love to God and our neighbor. The grand design of politics is to develope the good and suppress the bad in humanity, to the advantage of the State. Religion does the same thing, to the advantage of the individual, the component element of the State. Strictly speaking, the State is but the individual multiplied. Or more properly, the State is the family enlarged. So that whatever is for the true interest of the individual or the family, becomes, *mutatis mutandis*, the true interest of the State. It follows, therefore, that if religion and business may be united in the individual, and religion and domestic government in the family, so, on the same principles, religion and politics should be united in the government of the State. The popular fallacy, therefore, which would dissever religion from politics, would, on the same principles, divorce it from every pursuit, calling, and relation in life, except what is called "divine worship" in the sanctuary. This is wholly contrary to the teachings of the Bible, which clearly set forth the idea that religion is to be mixed up with all that we do, say, think,

and feel; "in that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD." So that whatever we do, "whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we are to do all to the glory of God." Nay, more, the Bible teaches that the principles of the world are to be changed and conformed to the principles of religion; and that the kingdoms of the world are to become the kingdoms of Christ; when kings and queens shall be "nursing fathers and nursing mothers" to the Church. This, surely, does not look as though politics were to be divorced from religion. It is the confident expectation of Christians, that the principles of Christianity, hitherto triumphant, will finally prevail over the whole world, and embrace the entire family of man. This glorious vision of the future is called, in homiletic language, the "*millenium.*" Then, of course, there can be no separation between religion and politics. And if not *then*, there should not be *now*, since the principles that will characterize and predominate in the millenial state, are the very same that are at work now in bringing it about. It is a great mistake to suppose that one kind of principles will work in bringing about the millenium, and another kind will predominate during the millenium. This would be to imagine that like effects were not produced by like causes! Consequently, if religion and politics will be necessarily and legitimately united during the millenial state, they are, and must of necessity be, united in bringing it about.

The popular dogma that takes it for granted that religion and politics should be divorced, is owing in part to the mistaken supposition that there is an intrinsic incongruity between the two; that both are necessary; that both are right; and that both are opposed to one another; which is absurd. Two truths can not be opposed the one to the other; no more can two things that are intrinsically right. Wherever there is antagonism, there is error on one side or the other, or both. The reason why religion and exist-

ing politics are incongruous, is that politics are wrong, based upon unholy principles, and promulgated by unholy men. Hence, this being true, it would be exceedingly unbecoming for good men, and especially the professed "ambassadors of Christ," to "come down" and conform themselves to, and become mixed up with wicked, worldly politics. Nothing so much disparages the usefulness, and tarnishes the honor of a minister, or a professor of religion. So that if the question were whether ministers of the Gospel should participate in party politics, in the popular acceptation of that term, and turn the pulpit into a rostrum, and the house of God into an arena for the discussion of subjects purely political; or even whether private Christians should be mixed up with the clamorous zeal amongst the followers of partisan demagogues; (alas! as too many are;) then there could be no dispute on the subject; since there is not a more contemptible—perhaps it would be more appropriate to say *lamentable*—spectacle in the world, than to see a so-called minister of the Gospel, a professed "ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ," "come down" from his "great work," don the garb of the politician, and participate in the rough-and-tumble conflict of contaminating party politics! Nay, is it not a just cause of grief to the true child of God, or even to one penetrated with a just sense of decency and good taste, to witness the ambassador of the court of heaven, clothed with a delegated character none other than that of the Lord Jesus Christ, participate with fervor in wordly affairs of any kind, whether civil or military? Would we not be horrified, nay, would not the very conception itself be blasphemous, to imagine the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, girt with sword, and sporting a military cap and feathers? Or even the pugnacious Peter, after he was imbued with the spirit and graces of an apostle, at the head of a band of soldiers, gallantly leading them to mortal conflict? How low the character of Saint Paul would instantly sink in the estimation of the world, could

we conceive of him in the Agora of Athens, making a furious speech on the subject of party politics! If, therefore, the question were whether ministers of the Gospel, and the meek and humble followers of Christ, should condescend from their exalted station, the highest and most revered in the world, and turn aside from their sacred calling to become followers of demagogues and participants in the devious ways and infamous practices of party politics, it would be idle, nay, ridiculous, to discuss it. And yet, with sadness unfeigned, and deep mortification, we are constrained to confess that there are not a few so-called ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ who have brought dishonor upon themselves and shame upon their profession, by bounding into the arena of secular politics, and engaging fiercely in party strife; whilst multitudes of the professed followers of Him "who strove not, neither was His voice heard in the streets," encouraged, if not emboldened, by the clerical examples, glory in being hangers-on of corrupt and unprincipled demagogues, coming at their beck and call, and bowing submissively to their every command! Let every such hybrid minister of the Gospel, every reverend, and honorable and reverend, and gallant "ambassador of Christ," be assured that they gain nothing worth having by their double and abnormal character. They lose the confidence of the good, and the respect of the bad. The wicked rabble, delighted more by their degradation than pleased with their partisanship, will huzza to their faces, and curse behind their backs! So that a minister of the Gospel, participating with zeal in secular and worldly affairs, scarcely ever fails to sink below the common level of the secular class with which he identifies himself. We earnestly hope that the time is not far distant, when provision will be made, in our branch of the Church, at least, for the voluntary or forcible demission of the holy office of the ministry, by all who give unmistakable evidence that they have mistaken their calling.

It is with sincere sorrow that we have felt constrained to make the foregoing remarks. We have not been insensible to a painful struggle going on in our own bosom between personal friendship on the one part, and a sense of duty on the other—tenderness for the feelings of some of our ministerial brethren, who have allowed themselves to be drawn into the great whirlpool of purely worldly affairs, and an uncompromising allegiance to Him whose "kingdom is not of this world." But, however sorely tempted, we dare not expunge what has been written, in order to save the feelings of some of our excellent, but misguided brethren. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me."

But whilst we inveigh most zealously and emphatically against ministers of the Gospel condescending to participate in party politics, and can not but regard the "ambassadors of Christ" as decidedly out of place, (except in some very rare instances,) seated in a legislative hall, or occupying a position other than that of chaplain in the army or navy, yet we are equally earnest in opposing the popular and injurious fallacy that would divorce religion from politics. It seems never to have come into the mind of the advocates of the false theory which we are combating, that Christianity is essentially aggressive in its nature—that its tendency is to impregnate all that belongs to humanity with its own principles—all worship, all science, all art, all legislation, all commerce, all business, all amusements, all pleasure, so that whatever we do, we shall do all for the glory of God: that it can make no compromise with the world; that it rejects with scorn a niche in the pantheon; that its avowed aim is to overthrow every institution of degenerate man that is not in harmony with itself; that its sceptre is destined to rule over all other sceptres, and its kingdom to swallow up all other kingdoms! Consequently Christianity, according to the teach-

ing of its founders, and the faith and hope of all its true disciples, is, in due time, to become the law of the whole world! Then, of course, there can be no disseverance between religion and politics.

But it is of the utmost importance to have correct views as to *how* Christianity is to achieve this glorious triumph, and as to the *manner* in which the Church and people of God are to exercise a controlling influence over politics, as over all other human pursuits and relations. It is not by being conformed to the world as it is, but by transforming the world to Christ; not by a union of Church and State in formal bands, any more than by a union of church and commerce, the church and manufactures, or church and law, or medicine, or any other calling or pursuit in life, but by transfusing the principles and spirit of the Gospel into politics, governing, law-making, and every other lawful employment of mankind. This accords with the explicit teachings of the Scriptures in delineating the NATURE and DESIGN of the organized Church of God, and the true MISSION of Christians in the world.

As to the *nature* of the Church, it is wholly and exclusively a divine institution. It is to represent, not the world, but God; it is to reflect, not the sentiments of earth, but of heaven; it is to be the exponent, not of unsanctified public opinion, but of the Bible; it is to derive its authority, not from human government, or the laws of man, but from the revealed laws of God. Consequently, the Church of God can, in no possible sense or degree, be a world-representative institution. It is intended by its Founder to be wholly separate and distinct from the world. The Church is the "Lamb's wife;" and as man and wife are declared by divine law to be one, as Christ and His Church are one, therefore it is impossible for the Church, as the pure and faithful bride of Christ, in any sense to represent the world. Christ is the "head;" the Church is the "body," and as the head and

its several members are one body, so Christ and His Church are one, and separated from the rudiments of the world; as the vine and its branches are in unity, so Christ and His disciples are indissoluble.

And what is true of the Church collectively, is equally and necessarily true of the Church in its constituent elements. Its duly qualified ministers and members are required to present themselves a "living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable service," and not to be "conformed to this world, but to be transformed by the renewing of their mind, that they may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." The ministers and members of the Church can not, as such, be representative men, except as they represent God. Every true minister of the Church is an "ambassador of God," which is the most exalted office under heaven, because he represents not man, but God—not the governments of earth, but the court of heaven. And each and every member of the Church, however humble and obscure, represents God. Consequently, as the world lies in wickedness there can be no consistent fellowship between the Church and the world: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." It is clearly manifest, therefore, from these and like utterances of God's word, that it is impossible for the faithful and fearless "ambassador of God," and the consistent and persevering member of Christ's Church, to do their whole duty without coming in collision with and increasing the enmity of the world; "yea and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

We conclude, then, that the Church, whilst it may be encumbered with many errors and defects, which weaken its power and detract from its glory, yet in its essential

nature, it is wholly separate and distinct from the world; and that, consequently, for the Church to succumb to the world, to conform to its principles, or reflect in any degree its character, is not only without warrant from the word of God, but a perversion of its own intrinsic and essential nature.

In the next place, as to the DESIGN of setting up an organized Church, whilst it becomes incidentally a *fold* into which the people of God may be gathered for their individual instruction, comfort, and safety, yet it is mainly intended to be an *aggressive agency*. It is set up in the world to teach the world, to reform the world, and to bring the world back to its allegiance to God. It is to lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, until the whole world shall be embraced within its pale. It is to be a city set on a hill, that can not be hid; a light upon a candlestick that giveth light to all that are in the house. True religion, vital godliness, is not designed to be locked up in the bosom, like a jewel in a casket, for the secret and isolated enjoyment of the individual; but it is to be a pungent, active, and self-diffusing principle, a "light," a "salt," a "leaven," a "grain of mustard seed," multiplying, increasing, diffusing itself until the whole world is evangelized.

It is evident, therefore, from the Scriptures, that the Church is agressive in its design, and that the true mission of the people of God, both in their organized and individual capacity, is to enlighten the world, mould public sentiment in accordance with the word of God, and thus win the world to Christ.

As to the lawful instrumentalities of the Church in making the spiritual conquest of the world, we state in the outset that, "though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of

strong-holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." The aggressive agencies of the Church are such as make conquest of the "thoughts," the "imaginations," the minds and souls of men, and not of their bodies.

The Bible in its various utterances proclaims the final triumph of the Gospel, and reason and providence corroborate the same; but, it is all important to guard against error as to *how* this glorious result is to be effected. We must not, in order to evade responsibility, and excuse ourselves for doing little or nothing, lean upon any other agency, or trust to any other instrumentality, than that pointed out in the Bible. We must not sit still and imagine that the world is to be converted by *miracle*, or by what may be termed marvellous and extraordinary providences. This is not only *error*, but pestiferous error; since it cripples the very means designed by God to accomplish this end, the active instrumentality of Christians. There is no doctrine more clearly taught in the word of God than that the Gospel is to be spread, and the world evangelized, by the instrumentality of Christians. Vain is the hope, and groundless the delusion of such as imagine that the world can be reclaimed to God by any or all the so-called civilizing agencies that have been and are influential in developing and cultivating mankind. Such may prove valuable helps, efficient handmaids of the Gospel, but are powerless in regenerating the *hearts* of sinful men, and bringing them into subjection to Christ. Nay, it is absurd to look to worldly institutions to remove sin, and to reform the moral evils that afflict fallen humanity. Worldly institutions, however much they may contribute to alleviate the mere physical ills that flesh is heir to, yet are unable to regenerate the world, and to bring it back to God. They, of

necessity, represent the world as it is, reflect the sentiment of the world, and are "of the earth, earthy;" consequently, as the stream can not rise higher than the fountain, nor a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, the institutions of the world, even the wisest and the best, can not do more than represent the world; they are *sample* institutions; they reflect the world with all its evils. We have no warrant, therefore, either in Scripture, or reason, or the history of the past, for expecting the world to regenerate itself. Nor is this great consummation to be expected by miracle, in the strict sense of that word, except as God's glorious providence, and the operations of His Holy Spirit, in answer to the prayers and efforts of Christians, are a standing and a constant miracle; a miracle that is effective in encouraging and stimulating, instead of retarding Christian activity. In all the teaching, both of the Saviour and His apostles, the idea is prominently set forth that the kingdom of God is to be built up in the world by the people of God. They are commanded to "preach the Gospel to every creature." "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another." "For we are laborers together with God."

Since, therefore, it is TRUTH, and the MORAL INFLUENCE of Christians, (that is, the power they exert when acting in accordance with truth,) that is blessed by God to the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of the evils that are in the world, it follows that every one is not only bound, but encouraged to speak the TRUTH, and set the EXAMPLE in accordance with it, which God has promised to make efficacious in the advancement of His kingdom. Moral power is the most potent of all powers; it is a power not brutal, not physical, not natural, not intellectual merely, but it is a power whose ingredients are *faith* and *virtue*. It is truth, or that which is supposed to be truth, that constitutes the essence of moral power; and

when presented to the comprehension of others, is just as efficacious in the hands of one as another. This being true, it follows that every individual in the possession of truth, it matters not what his rank or station in life may be, possesses the essence of moral power; and consequently, must be held responsible for the use he makes of it; power goes with the truth. Here, then, is encouragement for the humblest Christian to speak the truth. Our vocation is that of *truth-telling.* The diffusion of truth is all that God requires of us towards advancing His kingdom in the world. If we will sow the seed, He will take care of it. "His word shall not return unto Him void."

Therefore we conclude, as the great province of the organized Church of God, and the great mission of its constituent membership, is to speak the truth—preach the Gospel, proclaim the law of God, "whether men will hear or whether they will forbear"—accompanied by a consistent walk and conversation; that this is the chief, if not the only instrumentality that the Spirit of God uses in the conversion of sinners and evangelizing the world.

It legitimately follows from what has been said, *first,* that the Church and people of God are responsible for the removal of the moral evils that are in the world, and for the final triumph of the Gospel; *second,* that this is to be effected, not by falling into the ways of the world, grasping the reins of government, and seizing the civil sceptre, but simply by proclaiming the truth—teaching kings and governors, rulers and the ruled, their duty—and, as the ambassadors of God, to speak with the authority of God; *third,* that they are not, from a carnal or timid policy, to *wait* until the popular sentiment becomes right in relation to the evils that are abroad, before they attempt to set it right. This would be to expect an end without the use of the appointed and appropriate means; to look for an effect, without the natural cause. No; the very design of the organized Church, as we have seen, is to teach the world, to

enlighten the world, and to mould public sentiment in accordance with the laws of God, and thus win the world to Christ. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" And *fourth*, this is to be effected in all popular governments, not by petitioning legislative bodies or executive departments, and thereby forcing legislation in advance of popular sentiment. This results in no good, but much evil, since, in popular governments like our own, legislative enactments, unless they reflect the sentiment of the people, are of no permanent force. Moreover, and more especially, for the organized Church of God, and the ambassadors of Christ, in their official capacity, to send up humble petitions to kings and governors, and legislative bodies, is inappropriate and degrading. God would not *petition* a king or a law-maker to do right; no more should His ambassadors. Jesus Christ did not humbly *request* the rulers of the earth to refrain from doing wrong; no more can His "bride," which is the Church. It is not the part or province of the ambassadors of God, or the Church of Christ in its organized capacity, to knock at the door of legislative bodies, and hand in their petitions, begging them to enact laws in accordance with the word of God, and to rescind such as are contrary to it. They might command despots, as the ancient prophets did, in the name of the Lord God; but, in popular governments, their whole and sole duty is with the *people*, who alone are the responsible sovereigns and law-makers—it is to tell them the truth, teach them, and thereby mould public sentiment, which is law, in accordance with the revealed word of God. Then legislation, and all other things pertaining to social relations, will come right of themselves, as a natural consequence. This moulding of public sentiment in accordance with righteousness, is the legitimate province of the Church and people of God; and is accomplished simply by TELLING THE TRUTH, the whole truth, plainly, fearlessly, boldly, kindly, earnestly, perseveringly; giving line upon line, and

precept upon precept, here a little and there a little; unflinchingly, unceasingly, until the strong-holds of error are undermined, and the bulwarks of wickedness are overthrown. Every one that has the truth is armed with moral power, and is bound to wield it. Every man is responsible for the trust committed to him, and there can be no possible justification, or even excuse, for his abusing this trust, burying his talent. The day of reckoning will surely come, when every one to whom has been committed the truth must give an account of his stewardship.

The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible, that the grand design of setting up an organized Church in the world, and the great mission of the Christian, is, by the zealous and active diffusion of light and knowledge, and moral and evangelical influences, to reform the world, and to bring it into complete subjection to Christ, until "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord." Consequently it is not only the privilege, but it is the duty of the Christian, whatever may be his standing, to endeavor, by all lawful means, to impregnate every profession, calling, and pursuit in life, with the principles of religion.

Few, perhaps, will deny the right and the obligations of the Christian to transfuse the principles of the Gospel into commerce, trade, and the business pursuits of life. They will grant that he may endeavor to Christianize literature, science, and art, because of the influence which they exert upon the minds and morals of men. Much more is it his duty to endeavor, with all his might, to evangelize politics, since there is nothing in the whole range of human pursuits that exerts half so powerful an influence upon popular sentiment. So tremendous is this influence, that the terms *unlawful* and *immoral* have become, in the minds of unreflecting people, synonymous! To pronounce an act contrary to law, is regarded by many as the same thing as pronouncing it morally wrong. Consequently, in the minds of multitudes, the standard of moral right and wrong is

not the table of the ten commandments, or the precepts of the Gospel, but the civil code. Is not this ascendency of politics over the Gospel, in its influence upon the moral sentiments of men, a most startling consideration, well calculated to excite the fears, and arouse the listless energies of all Christians who will but seriously reflect on the danger? In our opinion, there is nothing, not even the solemn worship of the sanctuary, so potent in moulding the tastes, opinions, and characters of men, as politics; from the fact, in the first place, that but few wait on the sanctuary, in comparison with the multitudes that crowd the hustings; in the next place, the faithful dispensations of an evangelical pulpit are adverse to the natural taste of unregenerate men, whilst those of the stump and the forum are in harmony with it. In addition to this, governors, legislators, and such as are elected to posts of power and trust in the State, whatever may be their moral character, are, for the most part, men of energy and talent, combining in one both moral and political power: so that, even should they fail to convince the understanding, they can compel the action, even in matters the most adverse to Christian duty, (as illustrated in the case of the Mississippi religious law, already discussed in this article,) until obedience becomes the established CUSTOM. And the whole history of the race, in every age and clime, testifies to the fact, that *custom* soon becomes the test of right and wrong in the estimation of the populace. Indeed, there is no wickedness so vile that custom, sustained by legislative and political power, will not justify in the minds of the ignorant. Tremendous, therefore, is the moral influence of political power, because it can establish *custom;* and custom becomes the popular standard of moral conduct. Moreover, and especially, political power, in popular governments, is intensified by the fact that it is *delegated;* it emanates from the people, and therefore its reflex influence, in a moral point of view, is much greater than that which flows from a monarchy or a

despotism. Hence there is no influence on earth so potent in moulding the minds and characters of men for good or evil, as that emanating from political sources. Christianity has no greater enemy, or more efficient friend, than may be found in politics and legislation. In nothing is the antagonism between the Christian religion and the world more manifest; whilst, at the same time, there is nothing that exerts so fearful an influence upon human opinions and practice. This being true, it would be a monstrous conclusion to suppose that religion should not endeavor to transform into congeniality with itself that which may become, and of necessity must become, either its greatest friend or its most terrible enemy. Nay, Christianity, as a radiant light, as a pungent "salt," as a diffused "leaven," is, as we have seen, necessarily aggressive in its nature; its tendency is to impregnate all that belongs to humanity with its spirit and principles; consequently it is not left to the mere discretion of the Church and the people of God, whether they will endeavor to christianize politics or not; they are bound to the utmost extent of their ability, to cast the "leaven" into that fermenting mass, so as to impart to it its own properties, and transform it into an engine for the advancement of Christ's kingdom.

Since, therefore, politics, in legislation and government, is an engine of such fearful power, in its moral influence over the minds of men, it is of transcendent importance that they be thoroughly imbued with the principles and spirit of Christianity. But by *whom* is it to be done? Who is responsible for this great transformation? Surely we can not expect godless and wicked men to transfuse into politics the principles of the Gospel. This is a moral absurdity. It would be to expect a bitter fountain to send forth sweet waters; a corrupt tree to bring forth good fruit. The inference is plain, that this is to be done by religious people; they are bound to look with a jealous interest after politics and government, and

to use all their efforts to bring this mighty agency for good or evil into complete subjection to the Gospel.

Let it be granted, therefore, that it is not only the privilege, but the *right;* not only the right, but the bounden *duty;* of the Church and people of God, to do all that in them lies to exercise a controlling influence over the politics of the world. It is their privilege, because the fact of being a Christian does in no possible manner or degree disqualify them for taking an active part in civil government. It is their *right*, because they, as free citizens, are a constituent part of the body politic, possessing the same interests and immunities in society with others. It is their *duty*, because they are divinely commissioned to evangelize the world, and therefore to bring all the agencies by which the opinions and characters of men are formed under the influence of Christianity. It only remains for us, in the further discussion of this subject, to investigate the manner in which Christians, in their organized and individual capacity, are to infuse into legislation and politics the holy principles and benign spirit of the Christian religion.

In the first place, it is very clear, from what has been said relative to the true nature and design of the organized Church, that, as such, it has no right or authority to administer civil government, or to participate in any respect whatever in purely secular affairs: that it is a depository of divine truth, from which religion and moral instruction only are to be dispensed: that the Church, as the peerless bride of Christ, is not allowed to petition kings and governors, and legislative bodies, to do right, and to refrain from doing wrong. This would be inappropriate and degrading. She may command, but not beg, in the name of the Lord God. The Church may not, in its organized capacity, engage in or even recommend, by way of deliverance, any worldly pursuit, calling, or enterprise whatever; not even the most philanthropic and civilizing, such as colonization, scientific discovery, asylums, nor even the

education of youth, except as one of the means of dispensing religious knowledge. All these enterprises are noble and praiseworthy, and may be engaged in by Christians, as the legitimate fruits of the benign and humanizing effects of Christianity upon their hearts; but they do not come properly within the province of the organized Church of God. But it is the prerogative and the duty of the Church, in its collective capacity, as the great depository of divine truth, and the great fortress of moral and religious influences, to *testify* in favor of virtue and against vice, and to make deliverances touching moral and religious truth and practice. When, therefore, the State trenches upon Christian morals, and politics invade the rightful domain of the Church, then it is not only the privilege, but the *duty* of the Church to lift up her voice on high, and in the name and by the authority of God, to proclaim the divine law on the subject. This will embrace a much wider field than many, without reflection, would imagine. It not only embraces the moral law, as contained in the decalogue, but the whole scope of Christian ethics, as promulgated in the New Testament. It includes the moral obligations growing out of the various relations of society; such as ruler and subject, husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, friend and neighbor, pastor and people. In fact, the moral domain of the Church, in which it is altogether proper and right for her to make deliverances, includes a very large portion of the field embraced (whether rightfully or not we shall not now debate) by politics, so that it is both the right and the duty of the Church to watch with a jealous eye the encroachments of the State, and in her organized capacity to *testify* against all iniquitous legislation. Farther than this, she can not go; with less than this, she dare not rest satisfied. The Church of God, in its simplicity and purity, is, in a moral point of view, the highest and most authoritative institution in the world, and to it the

world must look for wisdom and guidance on all moral and religious subjects.

In the next place, ministers of the Gospel, as the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ, are bound, equally with the organized Church, to dispense divine truth, and testify against sin and iniquity in every form and shape; with this difference, that the Church, from the necessity of the case, testifies at long intervals of time; and possibly one deliverance on any one subject, on the part of the Church collectively, is sufficient, as its utterance is intended to be a guide and authority, not only for the people, but mainly for the ministers; whilst the ambassadors of Christ, in imitation of the apostles and prophets of old, are bound to cry aloud and spare not, give line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, without intermission or cessation. As "watchmen upon the walls of Zion," they are bound to give the alarm, whenever they detect the approach of danger, and to repeat the alarm as long as the danger exists. It is the inexorable duty of the ambassador of Christ, faithfully and fearlessly to oppose iniquity in every disguise it may put on. Vicious politics, unrighteous legislation, come just as much within the purview of a minister's animadversion as vice any where else. Iniquity in "high places" must not be winked at, any more than iniquity in low places. It was the peculiar prerogative of the prophets of old to denounce judgments upon kings. In like manner, it is the inflexible duty of the ambassadors of Christ to tell the rulers of the earth their duty. When, therefore, politicians insidiously instill infidelity into legislation, and when they impinge upon the domain of Christian morals, or dare to interfere with the right of conscience, it is not only the privilege, but the duty of ministers of the Gospel, as faithful and fearless "watchmen unto the house of Israel," to expose the danger and to denounce the iniquity.

How sadly do ministers mistake, or rather consciously shrink from the discharge of their duty on these and kindred subjects! The fear of coming in collision with what he supposes (and often erroneously) to be public sentiment, and dread of incurring the enmity of some individual or family of standing in society, on whom, it may be, he is in part dependent for his bread, cause him, the ambassador of God, to cower before the face of a man. Alas! what a monstrous spectacle! What a hideous perversion, when those who claim to be clothed with the delegated authority of "the Son of God," bow to a vitiated public sentiment, or quail in the presence of a sinful mortal! What! is the profession of the holy ministry nothing but a bread-making calling, as we fear many regard it? and are preachers of the Gospel to regard themselves as representative men, reflecting public opinion, instead of opposing it, controlling it, moulding it, in accordance with the principles of Christianity? Let all such—and sad to tell, their number is multitudinous—reëxamine, in the light of the teaching of the Saviour and the practice of the apostles, their claims to be the ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ. Moral courage should be made an indispensable qualification in a candidate for the Gospel ministry. Let all timid and faint-hearted ministers of the Gospel remember that their sole duty consists in telling the truth; proclaiming the divine law; nothing more; nothing less: not in their own *name*, or by their own *authority*, but in the name and by the authority of the Lord God. The world is prone to regard the message from the pulpit as the message of the *man*. But see to it that they receive it as the message of God. Then your duty is done, God will take care of His word; it shall not return unto Him void. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dis-

mayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."

But whilst it is the duty of the organized Church of God, and of the ambassadors of Christ in their official capacity, to *testify* on all subjects pertaining to Christian faith and practice, and to proclaim the law of God in favor of virtue and against vice, in all the pursuits, callings, and relations in life, which of course includes politics and legislation wherever and whenever they overlap the province of Christian morals, yet the duty of the private Christian does not stop here. He is bound to regard with an active interest so mighty an agency for good or evil as politics, and see to it that it slips not into the exclusive control of wicked men. Here, in this particular, moral and religious people have committed a very grave error. They have slept whilst the enemy sowed the tares. They have stood silently and idly by, and have allowed this greatest of all merely human instrumentalities for effecting good or evil to pass without a struggle into the hands of men, the majority of whom make no pretension to vital godliness, nay, rather glory in the fact that they are not governed by the principles of Christianity; influenced in part by the fallacy, the futility of which we have already attempted to expose, and which their own conduct has not a little contributed towards establishing, and in part by the criminal disinclination, as contrary to the precepts of the Gospel as it is to the best interests of society, to enter the lists and lift the arm of antagonism against the railing opposition of irreligious men. Thus this tremendous power has, contrary to the design of the Gospel, been allowed to be usurped by men not only devoid of the spirit, but hostile to the principles of Christianity.

The Holy Scriptures teach explicitly that civil government is ordained by the authority of God: "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of

God." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto the governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well." The fact, therefore, that civil government is "ordained of God," is evidence that it is not the intent of the Scriptures that it shall be administered by wicked men, but by God-fearing men. He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. "Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them to be rulers." The injunction to pray for kings and all that are in authority implies that rulers are to be ministers of God for righteousness: they are to "judge not for man, but for the Lord." At the same time the Scriptures are equally explicit in warning against the elevation of bad men to power; "The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted." "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law." "As a roaring lion and a ranging bear, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people." "When the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn."

But why quote Scripture in proof, when the whole history of the past demonstrates the fact that the rule of wicked men never fails to result sooner or later in national misery and ruin? Nay, why even appeal to history, when the *a priori* deductions of reason itself will show that wicked men are not qualified to administer civil government in that way which will develope humanity in the line that the Creator designed it to be developed in, and result in the general diffusion of the greatest amount of human happiness? It will scarcely be denied by any one, that wicked men, in seeking political power are actuated by motives of ambition, avarice, or vanity. Their object is to promote self in some way or other. This being true, there would be just as much reason in expecting to gather grapes of

thorns, or figs of thistles, as in expecting the rule of such men to promote righteousness and the best interests of society. It is clearly absurd. Moreover, unregenerate men are, in the very nature of the case, disqualified for legislating and ruling in all respects for the benefit of every class of the community, from the fact that they are incapable of knowing all of the wants, and appreciating the rights of the regenerated, as such; for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" so that if they had the disposition, they have not the capacity, the spiritual endowment which will enable them to enter into and appreciate the rights of an enlightened and a tender conscience, and the privileges and pleasures of a regenerated heart. In some things, therefore, and they are the most important that belong to humanity, wicked men are no more capable of ruling for the best interests of religious people, than the blind man is to be the guide of the wayfaring. Consequently, it is unequal, it is improper, it is unjust, to elect men to legislate and rule for an entire community, who are incapable of appreciating all the wants, and discerning all the rights of a portion of that community. The inference is not only plain, but inevitable, that Christians can not, dare not, without violating their allegiance to Christ, and the law of true charity, vote for, or in any wise contribute towards the elevation of ungodly men to posts of political power and trust. It is, therefore, manifestly a sin, which never fails ultimately to bring with it its own punishment. To vote for or elevate bad men to public office, is not only to put men in power who, as we have seen, are incapable of ruling and legislating for the best interests of Christ's kingdom, but it is to arm wickedness, and to increase the power of ungodly men for evil. When a Christian elevates to office a fellow-man by his vote, he thereby delegates to him his own moral and political power. Fearful, therefore, is the

responsibility of arming bad men to do evil. It is every whit the same as though you did the evil yourself. In view of these facts, how is it possible for the sincere Christian, with the Bible in his hands, which gives explicit directions as to the character of the men who should be made rulers over the people, consistently with his fealty to Christ and His Church, to vote for other than good men? It is directly contrary to the principles of the Gospel; he can not do it with impunity.

But the obligations of the Christian, in relation to this very important subject, are not restricted to *negative* actions, they are also *positive*. He is not only to refrain from voting for bad men, but he is bound to do all that is legitimately within his power, to defeat their election, and to elevate good men, praying men, god-fearing men, in their places. In this particular, religious men have been very derelict in their duty. Many of them (alas! there are some exceptions) have not been *active* in elevating bad men to office. They have stood aloof, but they have stood idly and silently. Restrained by a weak timidity, or a criminal disinclination to encounter opposition, and under the impression that the popular current is so strongly set in favor of bad men and principles that it is in vain to attempt to arrest it, they do *nothing*, and congratulate themselves that they have not contributed towards the unhappy result. This, however, is a great and reprehensible mistake. They have, by their silence and acquiescence, contributed to intensify public opinion in favor of wrong, whilst, at the same time, they have discouraged and weakened whatever remaining inclination there was in the public mind to do right. They are, therefore, not innocent, but guilty, in the sight of God, of a grievous error. Idleness is not innocent. "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty." "If the salt have lost his savor," etc.; "Every tree that bringeth not forth good

fruit," etc. One of the deplorable effects of this neglect of duty on the part of the sober, quiet, and religious part of the community is, in many parts of the country, to deter the right kind of men from offering themselves, or allowing their names to be brought forward as candidates for what was once esteemed high and honorable office. Consequently, this most potent of all human agencies for good or evil has, in too many instances, passed into the hands of incompetent and bad men. It is, therefore, not a matter of indifference, or of mere choice, whether the moral and Christian people will or will not take an active interest in politics. The responsibility and danger of neglecting it is too great. They are solemnly bound, by the precepts and spirit of Christianity, to have an opinion in relation to political matters, to express it, and to act according to it in voting and exerting their whole moral influence in favor of good and against bad men and principles. Let every moral, sober, order-loving, good man, adopt it as a maxim from which he can not be induced, either by love or temporal interest, in the slightest to swerve, that he will never cast his vote, nor lend his influence, in favor of a candidate for public office, who is not, in the first place, in all respects competent to discharge the duties of the office; and in the next, a good man, in the proper acceptation of that term; or, in the language of the Bible, who is not an "able man, such as fears God, a man of truth, hating covetousness." But suppose no such man becomes a candidate for office; but instead of such, there are two bad men, one, however, worse than the other; what, in that event, is the duty of the Christian? We answer: it will be his duty not to vote for either, and to make known his reason for his course. In this way, his influence would be cast decidedly against the evil; and it would not be long before there would be a visible accumulation of moral opposition, that would soon be felt, against the rule of bad men and principles. Suppose, for illustration, that a town or a county contains one

thousand voters, six hundred of whom, though they may not all be members of the Church, yet are in favor of infusing into the legislation of the country moral and Christian principles, and elevating only good men to office, and act accordingly; and that there are in that community two bad men, candidates for office; one or the other, it is true, will of necessity be elected; it may be, however, by receiving only a few over two hundred votes; what will be the effect? It will be that, although he is duly elected to office, yet he is manifestly *not* the choice of the people; he does not carry with him the moral power of the community; his moral influence for evil is crippled; whilst, at the same time, the real strength of the moral and religious element in the community will be developed, and ere long, good men can be induced to represent them in governmental affairs.

Let it be granted, therefore, that it is the prerogative of the organized and visible Church of God, to *testify* against all iniquitous and unrighteous legislation: that it is the duty of the ambassadors of Christ to proclaim the law of God, and tell kings, and governors, and lawmakers, their moral and Christian obligations: and that private Christians of every name, and good men, whether in the Church or out of it, are solemnly bound by their allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ to take an active interest in governmental affairs, and vigilantly guard against their being administered by other than "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness."

In conclusion, the patient reader of this article may agree in the abstract with every point made in it. He may pronounce them all right in a speculative point of view; "but the attempt to carry them out in actual practice," he objects, "would array all the wicked of the world in fierce antagonism against the Church." We answer, that there is not a doubt of it. There could be no greater evidence of the truth of the sentiments contained in the

article. The most alarming symptom in relation to the state of the Church is to be found in the quiescent harmony, nay, the apparent amity, existing between the Church and the world! What has our Saviour taught us on this subject? What did the apostles inculcate? What is the confirmation of history until the Church became worldly? The pure Church of Christ has no greater enemy than the time-serving spirit, "the conferring with flesh and blood," existing within its own pale! "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." But from which has the Church of Christ to apprehend the greater danger, from the fierce opposition of the world, caused by the zealous and consistent discharge of duty on the part of its members, or from a state of tolerance on the part of the world, induced by the conformity of Christians to its ways and principles? The answer is plain. The efficiency of the Church of Christ does not consist in numbers, but in purity; not in worldly wealth, but spirituality; not in magnificent and gorgeous array, that captivates the eye of the vulgar, but in consistency of character and conduct. Therefore, let not the followers of Christ "confer with flesh and blood," but go forward in the fearless discharge of their great mission, which is to disseminate divine truth, and afford a demonstration of its power in their daily walk and conversation. This done, their duty is done. God is competent to take care of his own method of evangelizing the world. "So shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

article. The most alarming symptom in relation to the state of the Church is to be found in the quiescent harmony, nay, the apparent amity, existing between the Church and the world! What has our Saviour taught us on this subject? What did the apostles inculcate? What is the confirmation of history until the Church became worldly? The pure Church of Christ has no greater enemy than the time-serving spirit, "the conferring with flesh and blood," existing within its own pale! "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution." But from which has the Church of Christ to apprehend the greater danger, from the fierce opposition of the world, caused by the zealous and consistent discharge of duty on the part of its members, or from a state of tolerance on the part of the world, induced by the conformity of Christians to its ways and principles? The answer is plain. The efficiency of the Church of Christ does not consist in numbers, but in purity; not in worldly wealth, but spirituality; not in magnificent and gorgeous array, that captivates the eye of the vulgar, but in consistency of character and conduct. Therefore, let not the followers of Christ "confer with flesh and blood," but go forward in the fearless discharge of their great mission, which is to disseminate divine truth, and afford a demonstration of its power in their daily walk and conversation. This done, their duty is done. God is competent to take care of his own method of evangelizing the world. "So shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

P

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 21 1964
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

CONDUCTED BY

AN ASSOCIATION OF MINISTERS

IN

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

VOLUME XVI.

COLUMBIA, S. C.
PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE REVIEW.
1866.

A

I

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVI.

NUMBER I.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I.—SLAVERY, AND THE DUTIES GROWING OUT OF THE RELATION. By the Rev. JAMES A. LYON, D. D., Columbus, Miss., - - - - - - - 1

II.—THE DOWNFALL OF THE UNION. By the Rev. R. S. GLADNEY, Aberdeen, Miss., - - - - - 37

III.—DOES CHRIST REQUIRE THAT BAPTISM SHALL BE ADMINISTERED BY IMMERSION? By the Rev. JOSEPH BROWN, Amelia C. H., Va., - - - - 55

IV.—THE REV. DR. THORNWELL'S MEMORIAL on the Recognition of Christianity in the Constitution, 77

V.—REVIEW OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. By the Rev. JOHN B. ADGER, D. D., Prof. Eccl. Hist. and Church Polity, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C., - - - - - - - - 87

NUMBER II.

I.—CHURCH AND STATE. By the Rev. THOS. E. PECK, Professor of Church History and Government, Union Theological Seminary, Va., - - - - 121

II.—A SLAVE MARRIAGE LAW, - - - - - - 145

III.—RATIONALISM FALSE AND UNREASONABLE, - - 163

IV.—RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF THE COLORED PEOPLE. By the Rev. J. LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., Secretary of Foreign and Domestic Missions, Columbia, S. C., - - - - - - - - 190

NUMBER III.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I.—The Character and Conditions of Liberty. By the Rev. Thomas Smyth, D. D., Charleston, S. C., - - - - - - - - - 201

II.—Rationalism False and Unreasonable, - - 237

III.—Report of the Committee of Conference of the General Assembly and the United Synod, etc. By the Rev. John Miller, Petersburg, Va., - - - - - - - - - 253

IV.—The Proposed Plan of Union between the General Assembly and the United Synod of the South. By the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., New Orleans, La., - - - - - - - 264

NUMBER IV.

I.—Puritanism and Presbyterianism, - - - 309

II.—Saint Paul's Vision of Victory. By the Rev. Jno. H. Bocock, D. D., Appomattox C. H., Va., - - - - - - - - - - 326

III.—The Relation of State and Church. By the Rev. R. S. Gladney, Aberdeen, Miss., - - 349

IV.—Life and Times of Bertrand du Guesclin. By the Rev. A. F. Dickson, Orangeburg C. H., S. C., - - - - - - - - - 376

V.—Northern and Southern Views of the Province of the Church. By the Rev. Jno. B. Adger, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity, Columbia, S. C., - - - 384

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVI.—NO. 1.

JULY, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

SLAVERY, AND THE DUTIES GROWING OUT OF THE RELATION.

[At the first meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, in December, 1861, a committee, consisting of the Rev. Drs. James A. Lyon, C. C. Jones, and T. Pryor, was appointed "to prepare a pastoral letter on the subject of the religious instruction of the colored people, to be submitted to the next General Assembly." For satisfactory reasons, the committee did not report to the next General Assembly; but the Rev. Dr. Lyon submitted this Address to the General Assembly of 1863, which recently held its sessions in Columbia, S. C. It was referred to a committee, which recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this address be recommitted to the Rev. Drs. Lyon, J. Leighton Wilson, and Palmer, Mr. G. J. S. Walker, Mr. D. A. Davis, and Judge J. N. Whitner, to consider the subject-matter of the same, and report to the next General Assembly; and that in the meantime they are authorized to publish the address of Dr. Lyon in any way they may think best; and further, that the report they may propose to submit to the next General Assembly be printed in advance of the meeting, for the use of the members."

The resolution was adopted; and in accordance with the desire of this committee, the address is now published in the Southern Presbyterian Review, that the important matters involved in it may be maturely considered before the meeting of the next General Assembly.—EDS. S. P. R.]

DEAR BRETHREN: The providence of God has, in a remarkable manner, committed to the people of the Southern States the entire interests, physical, moral, intellectual, and religious, of the black race in our midst. This we regard not only as a great responsibility, but also as a high privilege, thus to be made "workers together with God," in evangelizing, developing, and elevating a whole people, which have been, by the manifest interposition of the Almighty, transplanted from their own land of darkness and degradation, where nature is not propitious to civilization and mental development, to this favored land of promise—this home of light and liberty, and, infinitely above all, of a pure Christianity.

Recent events in our nation's history seem plainly to indicate that we, as a Southern people, shall be relieved from every obstacle and embarrassment that has hitherto stood in our way, and shall be no longer hindered in the faithful and efficient discharge of the duty, and the enjoyment of the privilege, of ameliorating and elevating the condition of the slave population. To call your attention to this great subject, which is now absorbing the attention of the civilized world, and to encourage you in the discharge of your whole duty in relation to it, is the design of the present address.

The word of God promises explicitly that the whole world shall be given to Christ for "His inheritance." It even particularizes the fact that "Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands unto God." It also sets forth the means by which this glorious end is to be accomplished, viz., that those who have the Gospel shall carry it to those who have it not: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." But, in the case of Central Africa, it might seem that the Creator had imposed a bar in the way of this command being carried into effect by the white man: from the fact, in the first place, that the physical

conformation of that continent, unlike Europe and other countries, is unfavorable to the intercommunion of civilized nations. It is mainly destitute of harbors and inland seas and gulfs and great rivers, and consequently does not invite the commerce and trade of Christian lands, which is often a forerunner of the Gospel. And in the next place, the climate has, after repeated trials, proved fatal to the settlement of white colonies in that region. So that, but for the specific declaration that "Ethiopia should stretch out her hands unto God," we might have concluded that Africa was an exception to the gracious promise. But the mysterious and wonderful providence of God, whose knowledge is unsearchable, and whose ways are past finding out, instead of sending the Gospel to the African, brings the African to the Gospel!

The whole history of the introduction of the African into this country evinces an overruling providence. In saying this, however, we do not intend to justify the means, so far as human motives and agency were concerned; for these, no doubt, were characterized by avarice, cruelty, and a disregard of the laws of humanity. But, notwithstanding the wickedness of the instrumentalities, God meant it, as in the case of selling Joseph into Egypt, to accomplish some great design in the advancement of His kingdom, and the fulfilment of the promise made to Ethiopia. The goodness and wisdom of Providence are illustrated in turning the curse into a blessing, and in causing the wrath of man to praise Him.

We have no sympathy whatever with "the African slave trade." We have no good reason to conclude that the ban placed upon it by the most Christian and civilized nations—our own amongst the foremost—is unjust or impolitic. We can find nothing in its history that will justify it, so far as human motives and agency are concerned; although candor compels us to admit that, at the beginning of this traffic, Christian sentiment, in relation to it, as to many

other evils that have since been condemned in proportion as the popular mind has been enlightened and elevated by the principles of the Gospel, did not view it in the same light in which we now view it; and consequently it is but just to impute their fault more to the darkness of the age, and the low state of popular moral sentiment on the subject, than to the purpose of the individuals actually engaged. But whilst we palliate the moral obliquity attached to the agency that a former age had in this trade, on account of the defective moral sentiment on the subject, we could not now look upon the renewal of the custom with the slightest tolerance. It is not only a sin against the laws of God, both natural and revealed, but it would be a great detriment to the institution of slavery itself, as it now exists amongst us. Even in the light of political economy, to say nothing of the moral aspects of the case, it would prove an egregious error.

When we take into consideration the vast number of blacks already in the country; the ratio of their natural increase; and the limited extent of the climate and soil that make their labor profitable; it is manifest that a sound political economy does not demand the annual influx of raw savages to swell the millions already here.

Moreover, when we take into the account the additional fact that a slave is productive and valuable in proportion as he is civilized and cultivated, it is evident that the constant introduction of a savage and barbarous element into that which is partially civilized, would not only be unjust to those who are here—since that kind of discipline made necessary by this savage ingredient would be inappropriate and cruel to those who had been long here and were semi-civilized—but, it would, as it were, dilute and depreciate the whole. So that what might be gained in numbers, (supposing that a gain, which it is not,) would be lost in intrinsic value.

Still further, the effect of annually transporting multitudes of savages into the country would be, not only to diminish their intrinsic value, but to depreciate their marketable price. This, in turn, would work disastrously to the older States, where neither the climate nor the soil is favorable to the production of slave labor; but whose chief interest in the institution is in the rearing and training slaves for those States where their labor is valuable.

Again, "the whole scheme proceeds on a political blunder. Capital and labor, with the slave owner, are not distinct. The slave is 'the money' of the master, and is as really capital as he is a laborer. To reduce his value, therefore, is not simply to cheapen labor, it is also to diminish capital; consequently the country would be no richer by the importation." So that, in the light of political economy alone, no good, but only evil to the institution, could result from the re-opening of the African slave trade.

Moreover, the measure would greatly damage the institution in a domestic and social point of view. The scriptural aspect of slavery is, that "it is domestic and patriarchal. The slave, when this is practically the case, has all the family pride and sympathies of the master. He is born in the house, and bred with the children. The sentiments which spring from this circumstance, in both master and slave, soften all the asperities of the relation. They secure obedience on the part of the slave as a sort of filial respect; and at the same time engender kindness and sympathy on the part of the master as a kind of paternal affection. All these humanizing elements would be lost the moment we cease to rear our slaves and begin to rely upon a foreign market."

But suppose it was to our advantage, in a mere mercenary point of view. What if it did increase our national power? What is that, in the estimation of a Christian, or of a true philanthropist, in comparison with the immorality and the

wickedness of the traffic? If you re-open the trade, you will not only buy slaves in Africa, but you will, by proxy, *steal men!* "And while the Bible allows the one, it condemns the other. It is nothing to the purpose to say, (what is doubtless true enough,) that it is, after all, for the benefit and advantage of these very men to be stolen. 'We may not do evil that good may come.' We can afford a pecuniary loss, if that were necessary; or a political disadvantage; but we can not afford to *put the Bible against us.* We can not afford to sanction an unnatural traffic. We might regulate the traffic after it reached our shores. We might even reform *the middle passage;* but we could not regulate the trade as it would operate in Africa. There it would be the fruitful cause of war, and bloodshed, and seditions, and man-stealing."

This deliverance on the subject of the "African slave trade," we have thought it expedient to make, not so much for the benefit of our own people, or of the Southern States—for we feel perfectly safe in saying that, in our judgment, there is not one in a thousand, within the entire boundary of the slave States, who would not be invincibly opposed to the re-opening of the traffic—but we make it in Christian charity and forbearance, in order to remove suspicion and prejudice from the minds of Christians abroad, and the civilized world at large.

Whatever may have been the degree of moral obliquity attached to the original introduction of the African into this country, it is certain that we, as a people, are in no respect implicated or responsible. It was thrust upon the colonies, not only without their consent, but in defiance of their protest. So far, therefore, as we are concerned, the existence of the black race in our midst is purely providential; and we are to be held responsible only for the manner in which we discharge the duties growing out of the relation. The illegality of the origin of the relation, in past ages, and by another people, who entailed it upon us, does

not vitiate the righteousness of the relation as it now exists. "The wisdom of ages has concurred in the justice and expediency of establishing rights by prescriptive use, however tortuous in their origin they may have been." The fact that English and American domain was originally seized by the conqueror, does not vitiate the justness of the rights of the present occupants; no more does the injustice of the African slave trade, by which the slaves were at first introduced into this country, affect the righteousness of the relation as it now exists. The only questions, therefore, for the Christian now to determine are, in the first place, whether the relation itself is a justifiable one; and second, whether he is faithfully discharging the duties growing out of it.

As to the lawfulness of the institution of slavery, in itself considered, disconnected from its abuses, we scarcely deem it necessary to discuss it. Like the existence of God, it is taken for granted from beginning to end of the Bible. It is clearly authorized by the Old Testament Scriptures, even in the moral law; and repeatedly recognized by Christ and His apostles, in the New Testament, both in precept and parable. Disconnected, therefore, from its *abuses*, which are not necessary to its existence, it is manifestly a Bible institution, and consistent with the highest type of piety and practical godliness.

In the light of providence, the Scripture sanctions on this subject are abundantly confirmed and illustrated. Slavery has been incorporated with the history of the race, ever since, if not before, Noah pronounced the curse upon the descendants of Ham. It belongs, in some form or shape, to the normal condition of civilized society; and is essential to the progressive development and highest civilization of man. It has existed in all past ages; and will continue to exist for ages yet to come. It is incidental to a state of sin and depravity. Were all men pure and holy and just, industrious, virtuous, wise, and free from

pride, vanity, and indolence; and willing to act well their part, and to do that for which each one was by nature fitted; then there would be no need of slavery, in the common acceptation of that term—that is, for the superior to control the inferior, contrary to his will—for in that event each would promptly and cheerfully fill the exact place for which he was qualified; and humanity would be developed, and the race elevated, as a natural and necessary result. But in a state of sin and misery, slavery becomes necessary, not only as the less of two evils, which would be a sufficient justification, but as the only means to the progressive development and elevation of human nature and the attainment of the highest civilization. Not that one class is to be depressed while the other is elevated; but all rise together. The slave, like the parasitic plant that rises with the oak, is elevated with and by the master. Nay, we hesitate not to affirm that slavery comes short of its legitimate end, fails to exercise a humanizing and refining effect upon the character of the master, which does not at the same time develope and elevate the slave. The master and the slave necessarily rise or fall together. Brutal treatment of the slave will, by an inevitable law of nature, make a brute of the master; whilst humane treatment will, by the operation of the same law, ennoble the master. "In watering, he himself is watered." "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." We conclude, then, that as the race of man is in a fallen, depraved condition, and that we have every reason to believe that it is the design of the great Creator that man, by His helping grace, shall recover from this fallen state, and rise to a high degree of culture and civilization; that slavery, in some form or shape, is, in the existing state of things, essential to the attainment of this end; and will continue to be necessary, until Christianity gains such ascendency over the minds and hearts and lives of men—all men—as to bring the entire race under the absolute and delightful control of the spirit and principles of

the Gospel. Then slavery will, as a natural result, cease; not that one man will not serve another, but all minds and hearts being completely under the control of Christianity, there can be no antagonism of will; since what will be the unselfish right of the one to require, it will be the pleasing duty of the other to perform.

As, therefore, slavery, in some form or other, does exist, will exist, and must exist in the present condition of humanity, the next question that demands our consideration is, to determine what kind of slavery it should be—what kind will most accord with the laws of nature and the spirit of Christianity. In the first place, it is not the subjugation of the superior to the inferior, of the civilized to the savage, or the cultivated to the uncultivated; no good, but only evil, could result from such an incongruous and unnatural relation. The laws of nature do not sanction it, and therefore it can not exist, except from the force of accidental circumstances, and for a limited time. In the next place, it is not the slavery of one equal to another equal—a figment of the fancy, which has had much to do in creating a mistaken and morbid sentiment on this subject in the minds of many honest but deluded people: no good could result from such a relation. In cases where the minds and morals of men are equally developed, where there is an equal amount of culture and equal ability, both natural and acquired, then, in that event, there would be a manifest incongruity and injustice in the one enslaving the other, or holding him in bondage. It is true that it sometimes happens that an individual of the black race may be enslaved to an individual that is, in fact, his inferior. But this is the exception to the rule; it is his misfortune; he must, nevertheless, share the condition of his class. There is no intrinsic injustice in it; no more than there is in a subject's rendering obedience to a ruler that is his inferior in fact, or than there is in a child's obeying a parent less wise than himself. But that kind of slavery recognized in

the Bible, established by the laws of nature, and sanctioned by the experience and wisdom of ages, is the subjection of an inferior race to a superior, of a savage to a civilized people, of a barbarous to an enlightened and cultivated nation, so that, and in order that, the one may be elevated by the other. There is no law of God, either natural or revealed, that will justify slavery, where the benefits and blessings growing out of the relation are not reciprocal. Such is the character of negro slavery in this country. It is the subjection, not of a superior, not of an equal, but of an inferior to a superior race, of a savage and semi-savage to a civilized, of a degraded and idolatrous to a Christian people.

The most favorable condition of the black man, on this continent, is that of servitude. For this state he is eminently qualified by nature, being constitutionally kind, affectionate, imitative, and contented. He would be utterly incapable of taking care of himself, as facts do but too sadly prove, in the midst of a superior people, who had no interest in his person. There is no law, social or civilized, that can alter the case. He is semi-savage, and therefore is not fit for that kind of government suited to the white man. What, therefore, shall be done? Shall we discriminate in our legislation against him, and confide the execution of those discriminating laws to civil officers, who have not the slightest interest in him; and for whom they have not the slightest social sympathy, but, on the contrary, a decided natural repugnance? This would be cruel. Can any thing better be done, taking human nature as it is, and the inferior character of the African as it is? Does Christianity suggest any thing better than that which God in his providence has done; that is, to place this savage and semi-savage under a governor who will have a substantial interest in him; not only in his labor, but in his life, health, morals, and personal welfare—a master who will, from the nature of the case, feel a social sympathy for him, and who will,

withal, be held amenable to popular sentiment, the rules of the church, (if he be a member,) and to civil law, for the manner in which he exercises that government? This, beyond all dispute, is the best form of government for the African in this country. Is it not also best for the white man? The question is not, whether a free state had better introduce the African, or some other inferior and savage people, and make them slaves; but, on the supposition that the African, or any other inferior and barbarous people are already in the country, and a component and inseparable part of the population, whether it would not be best for both parties that the relation of master and servant should exist between them? We have seen that it is best for the black man; is it not also best for the white man? And here we do not propose to discuss, in the light of political economy, the mere dollar and cent aspect of the case, so far as the interest of the white man is concerned. Doubtless, the mere hireling relation between master and servant, misnamed "free labor," would redound to the pecuniary interests of the former. This view of the case, which ignores the interests of the laborer, and the very existence of the negro as a component part of society, may commend itself to the sordid stock-jobber and the so-called utilitarian, with whom a dollar and cent interest is the only end to be attained by the rich at the expense of the poor. But this view of the subject is infinitely beneath the consideration of the ambassadors and followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, and even of the high-toned philanthropist, whose highest aim is, not to coin the most money in the shortest possible time, but to alleviate human sufferings, develope human nature, and elevate the race of man, by storing the common mind with intellectual and moral riches. With this view of the subject, it is plain, that where a superior and an inferior race dwell together in the same community, it is better for both parties, and the ends of humanity will be more effectually attained, by the existence,

in law as well as in fact, of the relation of master and servant; for in that event, capital and labor would not be antagonistic, as in the mere hireling relation, but combined in the same interest. So that it will be to the interest of the master, in the absence of any nobler motive, to look after the personal welfare of the operative. And this, prompted at first, it may be, by selfishness, will, by the very laws of his nature, develope and cultivate mutual attachments, and all those softening, refining, and ennobling affections that spring from and cluster around the domestic relation. The most favorable condition, therefore, for the black man, as a race, to be in on this continent, is that of servitude. This, in the event that the mutual obligations growing out of the relation are fully and faithfully discharged, instead of degrading, elevates him, and identifies him with the intellectual, moral, and social status of his master. We have no difficulty whatever in concluding that the relation of master and servant, now existing in this country between the white man and the black, is a justifiable one. It only remains for us to inquire, in fearlessness and Christian candor, whether the obligations and duties growing out of the relation are faithfully discharged.

The time has been—and up to a very recent date—when, owing to our relations to the North, where, from a misguided and morbid, though sincere fanaticism, on the part of some, and a pestiferous and wicked spirit of agitation on the part of others, it was difficult for the ambassadors of God, and the propagators of Gospel truth, to investigate the subject of slavery, point out its abuses, and proclaim the law of God on the subject; so difficult, indeed, that many shrank from the performance of the duty, and but few had the moral courage to do it. Moreover, this state of things furnished a pretence, to such as did not want to know or to do their duty, to turn a deaf ear to the admonitions of the few who ventured, in faithfulness, to proclaim it. But God, in His adorable providence, has freed us from this em-

barrassment; so that *now* there is neither excuse for not proclaiming, nor pretence for not hearing, the truth in relation to this great subject. And if nothing else is to be accomplished by the dreadful convulsions, both civil and ecclesiastical, through which our country is passing, but to remove the obstacles and prepare the way for the more perfect development and evangelization of the black race committed to our care, we shall have abundant reason to magnify the goodness and wisdom of that providence which can turn the curse into a blessing, and cause the wrath of man to praise Him. Let us, therefore, honestly inquire what our duty is in relation to this all-absorbing subject, in order that we may, by God's helping grace, discharge it, whatever may be the cost or obloquy of so doing.

Were we to regard the slave simply as an *animal*—existing only in time—not possessed of a moral and intellectual nature like ourselves—not immortal—then the obligations growing out of the relation would be the same in kind as those existing on the part of man towards the domestic animals, and would be fully discharged, on the part of the master, by looking after the health and physical welfare of the slave; for the laws of God, both natural and revealed, forbid man from wantonly inflicting pain upon, or diminishing the happiness of even the brute beast. And he who does it, not only perverts the prerogative that God has given him over the lower animals, thereby sinning against nature, but he brutalizes himself. But when we remember that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," (Acts, xvii : 26,) and that consequently the black man is only a less fortunate and an inferior variety of the same species with ourselves; possessed of the same nature, physical, moral, and intellectual; being in the same sinful, fallen condition, subject to the same moral laws; having the same Saviour, the same hopes, and the same eternal destiny (Gal. iii : 28) with his master, then it is evident that the obligations on the

part of the master assume infinitely a higher character; rendering it imperative upon him to regard and treat his slave, not as a brute, but as a MAN; endowed with a man's attributes, and subject to a man's destiny; and as a fellow-traveller to the other world, where they are to meet again, not in the capacity of master and slave, but as sinners saved by grace. Hence the relation is not of small import. It is a very sublime and responsible one, equal, in all repects, to that of parent and child; or, if there be any difference in the degree of responsibility, it is in favor of the servile relation, in that a child is a minor only for a limited time, whilst a slave is a minor for life.

There are evils and abuses connected with slavery, as it exists in this country, not necessary to its existence; nay, even a detriment to the institution itself; known to all, acknowledged by all, and regretted by all good men, who have the good of the institution at heart, which must be reformed before African slavery amongst us will come up to the Bible standard. Let us correct these evils and reform these abuses, and then we shall have, not only the pleasing consciousness of having done our duty before God, but we can defend the institution against the wily assaults of the world. But we can not defend its *abuses*. We can not defend it in those features where it is against the Bible. And this has hitherto been an element of weakness. Here its enemies have had the vantage-ground, and will continue to hold it in this great strife, until we by reformation drive them from it. They have seized upon the abuses of slavery; they have magnified its evils, and represented them as essential characteristics of slavery itself, and an unthinking world has believed them! Let us, therefore, with a courage and a candor which should characterize not only the ambassadors and servants of the living God, but which are admirable in any character, resolve to do our part towards removing those confessed evils, reforming those acknowledged abuses, and making slavery what it ought to be, in

the light of the Bible; and thereby acquit our own consciences before God, and wrest from our adversaries their chief and only effective weapon in making war against the institution.

Slavery ceases to be a justifiable relation, when the advantages growing out of it are not mutual. There is no law of God, natural or revealed, that will justify one human being, however superior in natural and acquired endowments, in deriving a selfish advantage from the wrong which he himself inflicts upon another human being, however inferior. This is abhorent alike to the instincts of humanity and the golden rule of the Gospel, which requires us to do unto others what we would have others to do unto us, in like circumstances. The law of Christ is, that we should do unto our servants "that which is just and equal," whilst they should render unto their masters faithful and cheerful "obedience."—(Col. iv : 1; Eph. vi : 5–9.) Mutual advantage, therefore, whether viewed in the light of the Gospel, or judged of by the irrepressible instincts of humanity, is essential in the idea of a justifiable slavery.

The original endowment bestowed upon man, of "dominion" over the earth in all its varied kingdoms, was not intended that he should depress or thwart the purposes of nature; but, on the contrary, that he should develope nature in all her kingdoms, according to the laws originally impressed upon them. In this way, and in this way only, will man's "dominion" redound to the honor and the glory of the Creator. Surely, it was not the design of God, in bestowing upon man "dominion," that he should exercise that high prerogative in opposition to nature and adversely to her laws; but in harmony with the laws and proclivities with which the kingdoms of nature were originally endowed. Man, therefore, would but pervert his high prerogative, in trying to depress the rose into a thistle, the horse into the donkey, or a man into a brute. In this he would sin against nature, and be found fighting against

God. But to draw out, nurture, elevate, and ennoble the attributes that God has bestowed, in embryo, upon his creatures, is to exercise the original grant of dominion, according to righteousness; which will increase, and not diminish, the beauty and happiness of creation. If these principles are true in their general application, they are, *a fortiori*, true in their special application to the relation existing between master and slave, who have a common origin, a common nature, and a common destiny. Any course of treatment, therefore, which does not develope the slave in the very line and channels in which God designed him to be developed, is wrong; and especially that treatment which tends to blast the affections which the Creator has placed in the bosom of man, thus perverting the design of God, in the constitution of man, is not only wrong, but intolerably wicked; and is injurious both to the master and the slave. It is a great fallacy to suppose that any one of the true interests of slavery requires a violation of the laws of God. It is always best to do right; and never justifiable to persist in doing wrong, because rectification would be attended with temporary inconvenience. This is not only abhorent to sound morals, but it is an error in political economy. The experience of the world has found that "honesty is the best policy," in all things. That "we may not do evil that good may come," is, in the long run, as true in politics as in morals—in our relations to men, as well as in our relations to God. Therefore we conclude that it is a dictate of worldly wisdom, as well as of piety towards God, for us, as a church, and as a Southern people, whose special mission it is made, by an overruling Providence, to take care of slavery, and to make it redound to the honor and glory of God, and the happiness of our fellow men, to correct its abuses, remove its evils, and bring it up to the Bible standard. With this end in view, we respectfully direct your serious attention to the following considerations.

The law of God, both natural and revealed, makes it obligatory upon the master (Gen. xviii : 19) not to depress, but to cultivate the slave, develope his attributes and affections, intellectual, moral, and religious, in the exact line in which God designed humanity to be developed; in order that the slave may be elevated, not equal to, but *pari passu* with his master. Consequently, the very same kind of instruction, the same natural relations, the same moral development, the same social affections, and the same religious ideas applicable to the cultivation of the white man, are equally applicable to the development of the black. It is not meant that the same degree of culture, under existing circumstances, is as applicable to the black man as to the white. This would be inappropriate to his condition as a slave. But that the slave, nevertheless, should be developed in every attribute of his nature, to a degree consonant with his condition as a slave; and should bear a relative proportion to the development of his master. The ignorance and imbecility of an intellectual being is an evil, in every aspect in which it may be viewed. Consequently, it is the duty of the master to remove this evil, and to cultivate his slave. And this culture, whilst it developes the conscience, enlarges the mind, and improves the capacity of the slave for religious enjoyment—which should be a sufficient inducement with all true philanthropists—at the same time (contrary to the narrow views of the sordid utilitarian) enhances the value of the slave, and ennobles the institution.

Every creature of God is improved by cultivation, and is thereby rendered more useful and productive of good. Even a tree is made more fruitful, and a flower more beautiful, by cultivation. Every bird and beast is improved by a similar process. Much more is a human being made useful by increasing his capacity to think and to reason. In proportion as the head is stored with knowledge, the hand becomes skilful in execution. A slave educated to the

practice of some trade, or handicraft, is the more valuable on that account. A laborer educated to think, to plan, to execute, is better capable of ploughing, sowing, ditching, draining, building, making implements of husbandry, taking care of property, and the performance of every species of work, than he could possibly be in the absence of such education. A smart slave is more valuable than a stupid one. So that culture, in modern as well as in ancient times, instead of diminishing, increases both the intrinsic and marketable value of the slave.

Moreover, it follows, as a natural consequence, that the more intelligent a slave is, and the greater his capacity to reason, the more contented he is with his servile condition, provided he is treated correctly, and the less likely to engage in insurrectionary and unlawful enterprises, since he is the more capable of perceiving, not only the hopelessness of such dangerous and futile attempts, but the undesirableness of success, even were they feasible. It is the ignorance, and not the intelligence of slaves, that is a just cause of fear.

Still further: it is perfectly manifest that in proportion as a slave's conscience is cultivated in accordance with the principles of the Bible, the less likely is he to become a criminal. So that, in every aspect of the case, it is clearly to the advantage of the institution that the slave should be elevated from his savage condition, civilized and Christianized; or in other words, developed and cultivated in accordance with the laws originally impressed by the Creator upon the nature of man. If this, in the course of time, should elevate the black man to a moral and intellectual equality with the master, and eventually set him free, then it will be a natural and just result. It is God, through the operation of His own laws, and not man, that does the deed; and, consequently, it should be a cause of gratification to every true philanthropist. What God hath put asunder, let not man join together.

As to the best method of carrying into effect the principles here advocated, we presume not to prescribe any specific course. We would suggest, however, that, as far as practicable, the whites and the blacks worship God together in the same assembly on the Sabbath. If the instructions from the pulpit are plain and simple, and illustrated to the easy comprehension of all grades of white people, they will be, in a good degree, intelligible to the black people; or, where this is impracticable, as it doubtless is in many instances, let the harangues addressed exclusively to the slaves not consist of ridiculous anecdote, and passionate appeals only to their emotional nature; but let them be largely characterized by substantial instruction, addressed to their intellectual faculties. The mind of man is developed and enlarged by thinking; and it is truth, not feeling, that constitutes food for thought. That kind of preaching, therefore, that will inject into the mind of the slave new ideas, and furnish him with the material for thought, is the kind best calculated to develope his intellect and improve his heart. Next to preaching, and especially in the absence of it, let the slaves, as far as practicable, be collected every Sabbath day into catechetical and Bible classes, and instructed in the principles of the Christian religion. And let every master feel bound to do this himself, or to provide for its being done. The pious and intelligent overseer who should perform this duty would double his influence with the slaves, and be worthy of double hire. And let the household servants be made to attend family worship, at least every Sabbath morning; and let that worship be short and simple, remembering the words of the Saviour, that we are "not heard for our much speaking."

As to the literary instruction of slaves, we do not advise that, in their present condition, they be sent to schools and academies. But we do earnestly recommend that all those statute laws prohibiting the teaching of slaves to read be repealed; since, in the first place, if there ever was a neces-

sity for them, it does not now exist. Instead of an undue tendency, on the part of masters, to enlighten and to cultivate their slaves, which needs to be restrained by legal enactments, the tendency is just the other way. In the next place, there should be no legal disability in the way of a master's increasing the capacity and value of his slave by teaching him to read and write, thus qualifying him the better to superintend his farm or his factory; or for giving religious instruction, if need be, to his other servants. Still further, the laws in question have accomplished no good, in fact, even supposing the keeping the slave in ignorance to be a good; since, doubtless, as many have been taught to read and write subsequently to such legislation as previously; so that the laws are, practically, a dead letter. Moreover, such legislation, whatever may have been the motives of those who first inaugurated it, or their misjudgment as to its necessity, was unwise, not only because it failed to accomplish any good end, but because it furnished a palliation for the conduct of such as wanted an excuse for not instructing their slaves; since it could be easily perverted into a design to depress the slave, and keep his mind in darkness; which is alike contrary to the principles of Christianity and the spirit of the age. It is, therefore, justly odious; and furnishes to its enemies a plausible pretence for charging upon the institution itself the necessity of perverting the laws of nature, by depressing the slave, and keeping his mind debased in ignorance, in order to its safe and profitable existence; which is, as we have attempted to show, the very opposite of the truth. There is something anti-protestant and peculiarly offensive in the idea of a fellow-man—for in Christ Jesus the master and the slave are one—being forcibly hindered from learning to read the word of God. Therefore, as it is a Christian duty to "avoid the appearance of evil," and a dictate of genuine philanthropy to disabuse the minds of our fellow-men of painful prejudice, let all those prohibitory enactments—so

unnecessary in fact, so opposite in their appearance to the principles of the Gospel, so contrary to the spirit of the age, and so easily misrepresented to the disparagement of the institution—be expunged from our statute-books; and let there be no legal disability in the way of a conscientious, law-abiding master giving to his slave whatever instruction may enhance his value and usefulness, and promote his growth in grace and the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Absolute authority ought always to be combined with the patriarchal relation, in order that the domestic ties engendered by this relation may mitigate the tendency to severity on the one part, and insubordination on the other. It is impossible for an owner of slaves to feel any thing more than a mercenary interest in them, if he but rarely, and then only for a brief period, mingles with them, but leaves them wholly subject to the control of hired overseers, who are themselves liable to move and to be removed at any day; who, in fact, frequently change their places, and who, of course, from the very nature of the case, can not feel any personal interest whatever in those over whom they exercise a brief but unrestrained control. In such cases as these, it is clearly impossible for either masters or slaves to comply with the apostolical injunction. It is, therefore, not Bible slavery. So long as the master lives in the midst of his slaves, or within convenient distance from them, so that he can visit them often, mingle freely with them, become intimately acquainted with them individually, and allow them to become acquainted with and attached to him, then those domestic ties will be developed on either side, which soften the asperities of the relation, and make it a patriarchal institution, such as is recognized by the Bible.

The evil alluded to is a growing one, and of great magnitude. In proportion as slaves increase in numbers, and lands wear out in the older States, there is a tendency on

the part of masters to remove to large towns and cities, or to send their slaves to new and more fertile regions, thus leaving them under the absolute and exclusive control of overseers, whose greatest recommendation, in many instances, consists in making large returns of the proceeds of slave labor. This is wrong; it is not in accordance with the precepts of the Bible, nor the dictates of an enlightened and elevated humanity. Let, therefore, the owner of slaves live with them, or near them, so that he can frequently visit and mingle with them, hear their complaints, lend a listening ear to their sorrows, sympathize with their afflictions, and comfort them in their distresses; thus being a father to them, whilst they will be to him as children. Such is the slavery sanctioned by Christianity.

The evil just alluded to suggests another, which increases in proportion as *absenteeism* increases; an evil more and more felt by large slave owners, who are under the necessity of leaving their slaves to the unrestrained control of overseers. We refer to the want of sufficient protection, in our legislation, to the persons and *lives* of the slaves. It is a part of the moral law that "thou shalt do no murder." And the word of God is emphatic in its utterance, that "whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." And the experience of the world has confirmed the wisdom and the righteousness of this divine mandate. The neglect of its sanctions never fails to generate evils. The laws of the land should accord with the injunctions of the Bible on this, as well as every other subject. Hence a sufficient and absolute protection should be extended, by law, to the persons and lives of all men alike; and especially to the lives of slaves, since they are forbidden by law to defend themselves against the assaults of white men. But the law of the land does not extend a sufficient protection to the lives of the slaves, in that it restricts the testimony that may be brought to bear for their protection.

A jealous overseer, a low, malicious white man, or a drunken, infuriated master, may take the life of a slave, without any just cause, and that, too, in the presence of any number of other slaves, and yet, if the deed be witnessed by no other white man, there is no legal evidence against the murderer; and the law allows him to go unpunished. This is an outrage against both the laws of God and the instincts of humanity, and cries to heaven for correction. It is an evil that grows in proportion as slaves increase, and are placed in large numbers upon distant plantations, under the exclusive control of hired overseers. Such circumstances of relation can not, from the nature of the case, inspire even a good overseer with the solicitude of real ownership. How much less, then, the wicked overseer, without the fear of God or man in his heart, who feels, as is too often the case, no other than a hireling's interest in the helpless beings over whom he exercises absolute dominion. This is a very great evil—felt, no doubt, more sensibly in the newer portions of our country than in the older—which needs immediate correction. The rejection of slave testimony was, doubtless, a wise precaution when the African was first introduced into this country, a rude savage, without the knowledge of God or His laws. And even yet, it would not be safe nor proper that the testimony of slaves should, under any circumstances, be taken as *direct* evidence against a white man, however mean and low that white man may be, since he may, notwithstanding, be a master. But two hundred years' association with the white man, and discipline under the benign and elevating influences of the Christian religion, have, as might be expected, wrought a great transformation in the moral and intellectual character of the African. He is far from being the rude savage that he was on his first arrival. He is semi-civilized and Christianized. So that the considerations which, in a former age, were eminently wise and appropriate, in providing a salutary precaution against receiving the

evidence of slaves in courts of law, do not now, in the present advanced stage of Christian culture and civilization of the black race in our midst, possess the same weight. Consequently, we would respectfully suggest to the wisdom of our legislators the propriety of receiving the testimony of slaves in murder cases; not as direct evidence—this would be inappropriate—but as equivalent to *circumstantial* evidence—that is, for what it is really worth, when corroborated by other legal evidence. This would, to a great extent, mitigate the evil referred to; since it would subject the slayer of a slave to the necessity of standing a trial before the legal tribunals of the land, and to the risk of being convicted; which would serve as a great restraint to the propensity, too often indulged, to take the life of a slave, influenced by passion, fear, or hatred.

And in this connexion we would testify against the practice, too prevalent in many localities, of unauthorized assemblies taking the law into their own hands, and inflicting summary punishment upon slaves for capital offences, without the forms of law. The fact that several individuals, of their own free will and accord, combine to do this, instead of one, makes it none the less unlawful. The plea, that prompt and summary punishment is necessary, in order to inspire a salutary terror into the minds of slaves—even supposing it accomplished the end designed, which may be doubted—is more than overbalanced by the damage done to the majesty of law by such lawless procedure. It is a very great evil for any community to feel that the *law* is not a sufficient safeguard and protection to person and property. "We may not do evil that good may come." Obedience to law is a Christian duty. And just in proportion as society submits to the spirit and the forms of law, and yields to its dictates implicit obedience, in that degree does law become a wall of defence to society. But to break through the forms of law, without absolute necessity, is a dangerous precedent. It weakens its power, disarms its

authority, and is the entering wedge, first to anarchy, and next to despotism. Therefore we earnestly dissuade from participation in extra-legal proceedings in the execution of the death penalty, or the infliction of great bodily punishment, transcending the measure prescribed in the word of God.

But perhaps there is no dereliction connected with negro slavery, as it exists in this country, fraught with more evil, whether viewed in relation to the happiness and moral character of the slave himself, or to the interests of the institution as such, than that of ignoring, in our legislation, the marriage and domestic relations amongst slaves. This is, indeed, a crying and a damaging evil, that sets at defiance the precepts of the Bible, the dictates of nature, and the moral sentiment of humanity. There is no law of God more clearly and repeatedly promulgated, in both natural and revealed religion, than that constituting the marriage and the domestic relations. There is no institution, human or divine, so efficient in developing the various attributes of man's nature, and, consequently, in yielding so much unalloyed happiness, as that of the family, as God constituted it. The relations of husband and wife, parent and child, next to our relation to God in filial love and Christian faith, are calculated to develope and cultivate traits and amenities in the nature of man, without which humanity is defective, and unproductive of true happiness. The family is a school which God has established, in which we are trained to be better men, better rulers, better subjects, better masters, better slaves, better neighbors, better friends, and better Christians. Hence it is impossible, from the very nature of the case, to civilize, elevate, and Christianize a savage people, in the absence of the conjugal and domestic ties. The whole Gospel can not be preached to a people in that condition. It would be a mockery alike of the moral law and the precepts of Christianity. To make the

attempt would be to regard and treat the slave as a brute, and not as a man. And yet, it is not worth while to attempt to disguise the fact that, however much humane and conscientious individuals may attempt to respect the marriage and domestic relations, as existing between their own slaves—and we are happy to testify that multitudes do—yet, nevertheless, the laws of the land, for which we are all and every one responsible, wholly ignore the marriage relation as existing among slaves. There is nothing in our legislation, so far as we know, that recognizes marriage between the slaves; or that prohibits fornication, adultery, bigamy, incest, or even rape amongst them. This is an outrage upon the laws of God, both natural and revealed, except on the presumption that the slave is not a man, but a *brute*, with a brute's propensities, a brute's nature, and a brute's destiny. These evils, it is true, may be mitigated by the conscientious, Christian master, to some extent; but it is only a mitigation; since no one can prevent the domestic ties from being sundered at the will of the unfeeling or unfortunate master, the creditor, the executor, or the law commissioner. And the fact that this violation of God's law is done by human law, does not relieve our consciences, or extenuate our guilt, in the least, from the fact that we, the people, are the makers of law. Did we live under a despotism, had we no part in the framing of laws and the establishment of government, then our responsibility for this and other evils in our legislation would not be so great. Nevertheless, as the ambassadors, not of an earthly potentate, but of "the King of kings and Lord of lords," we are commissioned and bound to tell law-makers, rulers, and governors, their duty, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. But our government is a popular government, and every freeman is a sovereign; and all are responsible alike for the laws, and the manner in which they are executed. Consequently, no citizen who has a right to vote, or even to speak the truth, can free

himself from the responsibility attending the legislation of the land, until he has exerted all his influence, in every lawful way, to make it accord with righteousness.

The evils growing out of this dereliction in our legislation are of great magnitude, and two-fold—*negative* and *positive*. It not only diminishes the amount of happiness that the merciful Creator designed should grow out of the holy estate of wedlock, but, like the violation of every other law of nature, it inflicts positive suffering, and adds greatly to the sad lot of human woe. It not only embarrasses the development of the slave, as a human being, but it dwarfs and brutalizes his moral and social nature. It not only diminishes his value as an efficient, trustworthy servant, but it increases the expense of managing him, and especially of rearing his offspring. So that such unrighteous dereliction in our legislation is alike a sin against God, and a detriment to the best interests of the institution of slavery.

"It is not good that the man should be alone," said the merciful Creator, on the morning of the wedding-day of the father of our race; and therefore provided for him a help meet for him, suitable for him, the complement of his nature, and they twain were one. For this cause "a man must leave father and mother"—the dearest friends that he has on earth—and "cleave unto his wife." Solomon says, "whoso findeth a wife, findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favor of the Lord." In the Old Testament prophecies, God represents the relationship existing between Him and His people as the relationship of parent and child. And when His people are regarded in their collective capacity as a Church, the relationship is represented as a *marriage*, spoken of under the figure of husband and wife; showing, by implication, that the one relation, that existing between husband and wife, is as natural and binding as that between parent and child. In the New Testament the very same view of the subject is repeatedly set forth. Paul runs a par-

allel between the union of Christ with His Church and the union of husband and wife. The Saviour says, "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore, they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

The family, therefore, is a divine institution; and is essential to the development of certain attributes and affections in human nature, and the perfection of humanity. There are certain germinal elements in the constitution of man, which require the genial influences of the domestic relations to cause them to spring forth in beauty, and bear the rich fruits of joy. In the absence, therefore, of this divinely constituted institution, human nature can not be developed in the manner designed by God. It consequently becomes abnormal, and unproductive of that degree of human happiness which is man's natural right. The union of one man and one woman in the sacred ties of wedlock; drawn together by the bonds of a pure love; fused into one by the glowing warmth of a genuine and ever-increasing affection; their lives from henceforth to run in the same channel, having a common heart, a common life, a common interest, common joys, common sorrows, common fears and hopes and destiny; in short, a common being in all that pertains to time, is productive of the highest and purest happiness that belongs exclusively to earth. This law of man's nature—the natural right to the happiness flowing from it—no power on earth can frustrate, without setting at defiance the clearly revealed laws of God. But, lamentable as the fact is, and however much to be deplored, this holy institution, as existing between the slaves, is wholly ignored by the laws of the land. There is no law, in any State, so far as we know, that recognizes marriage between the slaves, or that condemns any of the vices

growing out of the relation of the sexes as perpetrated between the slaves. In this respect, therefore, our legislation does not conform to the principles of Christianity, nor to the dictates of nature, but is a sin against both; and, as a natural consequence, is attended with evils of immense magnitude. It is alike a sin against heaven, and a damage to the institution of slavery itself. Whenever human legislation is contrary to the dictates of nature, to say nothing of revealed religion, then we may be sure it is wrong, and will sooner or later inevitably result in evil.

It is wrong, in the next place, because it does a great injury to the slave himself. It suppresses conjugal affection; it perverts the growth of wedded faith; it weakens parental attachment; it sunders filial ties; it obliterates kindred bonds; it ignores wedded virtue; it opens the way for wandering desire; in short, it brutalizes the slave, and prevents him from being developed and elevated in that way in which God designed man to be developed. He can not, therefore, become a perfect man, with a man's heart, a man's affections, and a man's natural enjoyments. This would be a grievous wrong done to any human being, but most of all to the slave; since, from the very nature and necessity of his servile condition, he is cut off from those enjoyments resulting from the acquisition of property, the aspiring for fame, the pursuit of knowledge, and the cultivation of his mind. The only sources of enjoyment left for the slave—and considering his condition, they are all-sufficient—are to be found in the bosom of the family, as God ordained it, and in the worship of the Creator. To adulterate these fountains of the slave's enjoyment, is to deprive him of his natural rights—the rights that God designs him to enjoy—and to inflict upon him the greatest possible injury. This no earthly power can do with impunity. God himself will sooner or later avenge his own laws.

It is, furthermore, a serious damage to the institution itself. This might be expected, from the fact that the experience of the world proves that no genuine interest is promoted by the violation of God's revealed laws, or the thwarting the purposes of nature. It is as bootless as it is wicked, to attempt to frustrate the designs of the Almighty, and to put asunder what God hath joined together. To nullify the domestic relations between the slaves is such an attempt, and consequently is attended with damage. It depreciates the slave, and renders him less capable of being a good and efficient servant. Every creature of God is depreciated by being depressed in its development, and especially a human being. The more completely a slave can enter into all the feelings and sympathies, into all the anxieties, hopes and fears, joys, sorrows, and inner life of his master, the better adapted is he to become a faithful and an efficient servant. The slave that is a parent, with a parent's affections, can the better appreciate a parent's wants, fears, and anxieties. The slave that is a husband or a wife can enter into the sympathies of that relation. The slave who feels the attachments of family and kindred ties, can the more perfectly sympathize with his master in those relations. In short, in all respects, in proportion as a slave is developed as a human being—as a man—in that degree is he the better capable of serving his master, and consequently is the more valuable.

Moreover, it is easy to comprehend how our present legislation, or rather the dereliction of our legislation, leaves the slave without strong family bonds to attach him to any one place or family. Hence he is not so unlikely to run away as he would be if he felt the strong attachments of family, and knew that he could not form new so-called marriage relations when and where he pleased, without being guilty of a state offence subjecting him to legal punishment. But, on the contrary, let the marriage relation be established between the blacks, according to the dictates of natural

and revealed religion, and let the slave be bound by family ties, conjugal love, parental affection, and filial and kindred attachments, and he becomes, in proportion to the strength of these ties, a fixture to the soil, and an interested party in the good order of society. Thus bound by nature's bands, the slave will not be so likely to make his escape to other regions, leaving such attractions behind him. With such interests in the good order of society, he will not be likely to engage in insubordinate schemes and insurrectionary enterprises, which would devastate his home, and sunder the dearest ties of nature. Therefore, the family constituted amongst the slaves, as God designed it should be, will serve as a hostage for the good behavior of its several members, and act with more potency than all "fugitive slave laws," in bringing the fugitive back to his home.

Once more: let the marriage and domestic relations between the slaves be established by law; let chastity and wedded faith be recognized as virtues, between the blacks as well as between the whites; let purity be esteemed a grace, and impurity a stigma, on the part of the black as well as the white females; and let the law defend them in the maintenance of virtue; and then our female slaves will be, in a great degree, shielded against the contaminating influence of beastly white men. The evil alluded to is enormous and dangerous, both in its influence upon the bond and the free. It degrades the white man, socially and intrinsically, and in a way that can never be remedied. And, what is worse, it destroys confidence, on the part of the slave, in the virtue, integrity, and moral bearing of the white man; and disarms him of his moral power to elevate and Christianize the slave. It is, also, dangerous to the safety and well-being of society; since, if the low, beastly offender in this species of crime suppress and eradicate those natural affections implanted by God Himself in the heart of a parent for his offspring, he thereby distorts his own nature, becomes abnormal and monstrous, and not a

suitable member of a well-ordered, homogeneous society. Or, if he yields to the impulses of his nature, and feels that attachment to his hapless offspring which nature's laws require, he must of necessity, in that degree, become inimical to the institution of slavery itself, and therefore a dangerous member of society. So that, in either aspect of the case, the perpetrator of such degrading crime is a bad citizen, and ought to be so regarded by law. The establishment of the marriage relation by law—thus making it as permanent and as honorable between the blacks as between the whites—would tend, in a great measure, to obstruct this degrading and dangerous evil.

It would, moreover, obviate another great abuse, illustrated in the advantage which the heartless and cruel mercenary has over the conscientious and Christian master, who is often subjected by the former to ruinous sacrifice in selling, or exorbitant extortion in buying a servant, in order to prevent the ruthless separation of husband and wife, or parent and child.

There is no abuse of negro slavery that is so abhorrent to the common sentiment of mankind, and that so effectually cuts us off from the sympathy of the civilized world, as the non-recognition, by the laws of the land, of the marriage and domestic relations, as existing between the slaves, and the evils necessarily growing out of it. This is something that will enlist the sympathies of all men, since all, even the poorest and lowest, can appreciate the sacredness and value of the domestic ties to human happiness, and the extreme wretchedness of having them forcibly sundered. Let us conform negro slavery to God's natural and revealed laws, and then the world will listen with patience to our defence of the institution. So that, in every aspect of the case, it is manifestly to the interest of slavery itself, as well as obedience to the laws of God, to recognize by statute law the marriage and domestic relations as existing between the slaves. This, whilst it may, in its be-

ginning, be attended in some instances with inconvenience, and possibly pecuniary loss, yet will soon become easy of execution, and greatly enhance the real value and dignity of the institution.

But suppose it did require sacrifice, and a great one, what is that in comparison with the value of doing right? Is not the approbation of our own consciences, the sympathy of the wise and good amongst men, and the favor of God, worth more than all other considerations, even in this life? But, especially when we remember that we must render an account at the bar of God, and look back on this subject from some stand-point in eternity, how then will mere sordid convenience appear in comparison with having done our duty? By no possible construction can it be made to appear that the true interests of slavery require a violation of the laws of God. It is always best to do right, whatever may be the temporary inconvenience or the apparent sacrifice of so doing. This is the wisest maxim for even men of the world to follow. But with the Christian, whose duty it is to "deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Christ"—who, if he is not willing to forsake father and mother, son and daughter, and all that he hath for Christ, is not worthy of Him—there can not be a moment's hesitation. Nay, it is absurd to speak of pecuniary interest being set over against Christian duty; or of personal inconvenience on the part of the followers of Christ, in reforming evil, and in refraining from doing wrong. It is no sacrifice for a Christian to conform his life and actions to the principles and requirements of the Gospel. The greatest sacrifice a Christian can make is to do wrong. Sin is the greatest calamity.

Finally, as the slave is a religious being, he can not be properly developed in the absence of religious ideas and instruction. This is another of his *natural* rights, which can not be withheld without sinning against nature's laws.

Religion makes him a happier man, and a better slave. Being naturally religious; having implanted in his mental and moral constitution, as all other men have, certain attributes and capacities, designed exclusively by the Creator for the exercise and enjoyment of religion; it follows that religion is as essential to the proper development, growth, and expansion of the mind and soul of the slave, as wholesome food is to the health and growth of his body. If this natural appetite for religion is fed with Bible truth, the mind and heart of the slave will be properly developed. But if this divinely prepared truth is withheld, then the mind of the slave will be filled with error, delusion, superstition, and silly vagaries, that will distort the moral character of the slave, render him miserable where he ought to be happy, and in some instances dangerous, misled by his delusions and hallucinations. That master, therefore, who does not provide for the religious instruction of his slaves, hinders their development as human beings. He is, consequently, guilty of injustice and cruelty—sins against nature—and will sooner or later suffer the righteous penalty.

Slaves without religious instruction are not so valuable as those who have had it. They are harder to govern, devoid of moral principle, less truthful, and less trustworthy. It is very easy to understand how that slave whose mind is imbued with the principles of the Christian religion is more contented, respectful, obedient, industrious, honest, conscientious, and truthful, than the one who has not been thus trained. No one can doubt that the slave whose conscience has been cultivated according to the precepts of the Gospel, who has been taught to believe in a future state of existence, in a final judgment, and rewards and punishments for the righteous and the wicked, is more valuable than one whose mind remains in heathenish darkness and superstition. This is evinced on the block, and in the market, by the higher price paid for the religious

than for the irreligious slave. So that it is for the pecuniary interest of the master, in the absence of any nobler motive, to provide suitable religious instruction for his slaves.

But even were it a dead expense, in a *pecuniary* point of view, that is no excuse for the neglect of a solemn Christian duty. God did not, by His providence, transplant the African from the darkness of heathenism, and commit him to us, in order that we should still keep him in darkness, and derive benefit from his detriment. No; it is the purpose of the Almighty that the advantage shall be mutual; and that the African shall be by us evangelized and elevated in the scale of humanity. It is, therefore, the inflexible *duty* of every owner of a slave to provide for him wholsome religious instruction. He is as responsible before God for his slave as for his child; and in one aspect, more so, since a child is a minor only for a limited time, whilst a slave is a minor for life; therefore the master's responsibility ends only at the grave of his slave. He who will not relieve the physical ills, and provide for the bodily comfort of his slave, is thought worthy of public scorn and detestation. But how much more odious is that master who, from sordid motives, or infidel apathy, will not provide for the religious enlightenment and spiritual welfare of the soul, the immortal part of his slave? Fearful will be the responsibility, at the inexorable bar of a just and holy God, of those masters who enjoy the fruits of the toil and sweat of their faithful slaves, and yet make no provision whatever for their spiritual welfare.

In conclusion, dear brethren, let us, with the Bible in our hands, resolve that, with God's helping grace, we will discharge our whole duty with regard to this great and all-absorbing subject, to which the eyes of all christendom are now turned. We have hitherto labored at a disadvantage in defending negro slavery as it exists amongst us, from

the fact that it has been encumbered with certain confessed evils and abuses, condemned by the letter and spirit of Christianity, which the world has mistaken for the necessary characteristics of slavery itself. Let us correct these abuses, which are not only contrary to the teachings of the Bible, but detrimental to the interests of the institution itself, as we have already shown, and elevate slavery up to the Gospel standard, and then the prejudice now arrayed against it, in the minds of Christians abroad, and of great and good men every where, will subside. There is a natural repugnance in the breast of civilized man against *tyranny;* but there is none against the *domestic* relations. Let us, therefore, make slavery, by law, the patriarchal institution that is recognized and sanctioned in the Bible, and it will appear in entirely a different and a milder light to the eyes of the civilized world than that in which it now appears. And let us not mistake our responsibility on this subject; and through fear, and a time-serving policy, excuse ourselves from prompt and decided action, with the delusive plea that we must *wait* for a suitable time—"a more convenient season"—before we move in this matter. There never was a more suitable time, or convenient season, to move and take a step upward on this subject, than the present, when the eyes of the whole civilized world are turned upon it; and all ears are open to hear any utterance that may be made in reference to it. Let us not sit still, and expect the world to get, of itself, into a temper to be reformed. This would be absurd; nay, more; it is wilful and wicked delusion. How is the world ever to get into a temper to be reformed, if the Church and people of God do not bring them to it? The very design of setting up an organized Church in the world, and the true mission of the Christian as a member of it, is that it shall be the aggressive agency, in the hands of God, of regenerating the world, and restoring it to its allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ. The disciples of Christ are to lead the van, and to be the

"salt," the "leaven," the "light," that are to dissipate the darkness that invests the minds of men, and expurgate the evils with which society is infested. And this is to be accomplished simply by proclaiming the TRUTH, fearlessly, earnestly, boldly, kindly, and perseveringly, in the name of the Lord God, whose "ambassadors" we profess to be, and of his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, whose "disciples" we call ourselves. This is the great instrumentality which God has promised to bless. "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please; and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it."

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen."

ARTICLE II.

THE DOWNFALL OF THE UNION.

We presume there is scarcely a man to be found, either in the Federal or in the Confederate States, who does not regard the dissolution of the United States Government as a great evil, in itself considered. The idea of a great government, and of a powerful people, has ever been captivating to the human mind. This idea of grandeur and power has been the ruling idol of conquerors and their followers, in every age. The Englishman, however humble his sphere, boasts that the sun never sets upon the British Empire, and prides himself on being an Englishman. The power and glory of France is the idol of the Frenchman. Each one loves to boast of the heroes and achievements of

his country, feeling ("*quorum magna pars fui*") that he is a part of it. This feeling is natural and powerful. It is necessary to the unity, the strength, and happiness of a people. It is the feeling of patriotism. It is akin to that holy feeling, the love of a child for its mother, and like it will suffer long, and endure much, before it can be extinguished. Implanted in man by his Creator for the wisest and best of purposes, that of uniting in friendly ties those who inhabit the same soil, it has in every age been abused by demagogues and tyrants, for the wicked purpose of robbing and oppressing the people.

No people ever naturally possessed a greater share of this feeling than the people of the South. It was with no ordinary degree of pride that they looked at the extent of their territory, the greatness of their rivers and lakes, the grandeur of their forests, the diversity of climate, the variety and fertility of soil, their vast mineral resources, the extent of their seacoast, with so many bays and inlets, and the rapid increase of their wealth and population. Nor were they forgetful of their achievements in war, of their power by land and sea, the magnitude and extent of their commerce, and their prospects of future greatness. Their orators, their statesmen and warriors, were ever foremost in vindicating the national honor. With money and men, the Southern people were ever ready to maintain their common country's honor, and to defend it, without regard to the sacrifice. They did the greater part of the fighting, and paid the greater part of the expenses, while the Northern people reaped the greater part of the advantages. Yet of all this they never complained. They did it cheerfully, inspired by their lofty spirit of patriotism.

What, then, has led to the separation of the South from the North? what, to this ferocious war of invasion by the North against the South? Is this the end of that government, once the pride of every American; that model government, demonstrating the capacity of man for self-

government, hurling its thunders at the despotic governments of the Old World, and threatening by its example and influence, by its declaration of rights and its proclamations of freedom, to usher in the great political millenium, when kings and emperors shall be hurled from their thrones, when the oppressed shall all go free, and the ransomed millions celebrate the world's great jubilee? Is the great United States Government among the things that have been? Is it numbered with the republics of old? Shall we say of it as of Troy—"*Troja fuit!*"—it was? Has it proven to be an *ignis fatuus*, alluring men from the path of peace and prosperity into the fens of death and desolation? Was it a meteor that shot athwart the political horizon only to attract the gaze of the world, and leave behind it a deeper gloom?

View it in what light we may, it is a mystery, in the providence of God, the solution of which is designed for the instruction of man and the glory of God. To the solution of this mystery we propose to devote some remarks. We believe in a future millenium, both religious and political, for they are inseparable. We believe in a spiritual reign of Christ upon earth. But we are not of those who believe in what is called the personal appearance and reign of Christ, and that the millenium is near at hand. Nor do we believe that it will be brought about by any new dispensation, or miraculous means. We believe the present dispensation and means already instituted fully adequate, when the providence of God has fully prepared the world for the coming of the millenium. This will not be until man has exhausted the cup of iniquity to its very dregs; until the race has experienced the bitter fruits of sin in all its various forms, and, thoroughly convinced of its utter depravity and folly, shall cast itself, in humility and faith, upon God. Governments will have no stability, self-government will have no existence, and there will be no freedom, until the world shall understand what is meant by the

declaration: "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed;" and again, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

If we turn to the politician, and ask him what has brought about the separation of the South and the North—if he is a Southern man, he will tell you, that by high tariffs the North has built up her manufactories; by a monopoly of the carrying trade she has built her shipping, enriched herself by bounties on her fisheries; and, aided by these, she has transferred the trade from the South to the North, and established her commerce by controlling the capital and the exports of the South; that, by robbing the South annually of millions, she has been enabled to make canals and build railroads, and increase her population; that to increase her tariffs and bounties, she has for years employed all the arts of legislation to deplete the public treasury, by making vast appropriations to internal improvements, distributing the surplus revenue, and giving away the public lands. She has systematically increased her power by holding out inducements to immigration, to fill up the territories with so-called "free States;" to weaken the South, she has opposed the admission of slave States, and even resolved to lessen the number of those already existing; to this end, she has fomented the spirit of abolitionism as much as possible; and that finally, having obtained a majority by uniting all the elements of opposition, she elected Abraham Lincoln upon the Chicago platform, which was a palpable subversion of the Constitution, and a virtual subjugation of the South; and that nothing remained for the South, but either to submit to a despotism established for her ruin, or to separate from the North, declare her independence, and maintain her rights, at every cost; that the North having resolved upon the subjugation of the South, determined to accomplish by the sword what the South refused to let her do by the ballot-box.

If we turn to the statesman, and ask him for a solution of the mystery, he will tell us about the importance of maintaining proper checks and balances of power in a government extending over a territory of such vast dimensions, embracing such a variety of soil and climate, and such a diversity of pursuits. He will tell us how difficult it is to prevent the danger arising from conflicting interests. He will point to the ordinance of 1787, and the Missouri compromise, as establishing sectional lines, which sooner or later must end in sectional conflicts, and the separation of the sections.

If, now, we turn to the philosopher for a solution, he will descant upon the fundamental principles and the various forms of government, and their adaptation to different people. He will tell us of the various prejudices and passions which endanger the stability of government. He will remind us of the influence of wealth and luxury in enervating the people, increasing their pride and selfishness, smothering public spirit and patriotism, destroying the love of liberty, ending in the corruption of public morals, and finally, the overthrow of government. He will, perhaps, instance Greece and Rome; tell us of their patriotism, public spirit, and energy, in the early days of their republics; the decay of all these, and their consequent overthrow, and the establishment of despotism.

All these accounts may be true, but they do not solve the mystery. It may be said that the United States Government was very different from the ancient republics; that the people are very different; that these existed in the days of paganism; that we are Christians; that we live in a more enlightened age—one in which education is general, newspapers, books, schools, colleges, and seminaries of different kinds exist—one of railroads and telegraphs, furnishing every facility for the diffusion of knowledge; that it is an age of art and science, revealing in the air, the earth, and the waters, what were once mysteries. It may,

then, be asked, if it be possible for the experiment of free government to be made under more favorable circumstances? If not, then the important question forces itself upon us: If republicanism, regarded as the only free government, is, under the most favorable circumstances, a failure, has man the capacity for self-government? If republican governments be assumed as models of free government, then history replies that a very small portion of the human race have, at any period of the world, given any evidence of the capacity of man for self-government. If we inquire to what extent self-government really and practically exists in republican governments, the proportion of those actually exercising self-government is greatly diminished. If, then, according to the Declaration of Independence, "all men are created free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," it is most remarkable that so very small a portion of the whole human race have ever inherited their birthright. It is still more remarkable that the Northern people, under the pretence of carrying out the above doctrine of the Declaration, should wage war upon the Southern people, and engage in destroying "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," by way of preserving them. All these considerations, instead of solving, only serve to increase the great mystery, and all the causes as yet assigned for the separation of the South from the North, and the waging of a most unnatural and unjust war by the latter against the former, are but proximate causes.

We shall now attempt another solution of the mystery. We are not a nation of atheists; and it need not be proved that there is a God; that He is unchangeable, and a being of wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. Nor need it be proved that He governs all His works; that His government is perfect, being a revelation of His attributes, as is creation itself, and in perfect harmony with

them; that He will not punish the innocent; and that whatever calamities befall a people, are consequences of sinning against Him. Further, between the sins and the punishments inflicted, there is an intimate connexion, viz., that of cause and effect. We shall attempt to point out some of these sins.

I. In the very origin of the United States Government, the perfect law of God, the decalogue, containing the moral law, was not only ignored, but principles were promulgated which are directly opposed to the moral law. These were set up as fundamental; became the prevailing sentiments of the people, and very extensively influenced all legislation. We assumed as self-evident truths that all men are created free and equal, and are entitled to "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." We taught that men are rightfully governed only by consent, and that civil government is a matter of compact. We laid down these broad assertions without any definition, limitation, or restriction, as fundamental truths, as axioms in government. The discovery of their falsehood and absurdity, and the attempt to define, limit and restrict them, have been matters of an afterthought, and without authority; every one having put his own construction upon them. We need not now stop to show the infidel origin of these doctrines, or to show what have been their legitimate results in France. It is enough to show that they are directly opposed to the law of God, and that, again, we are witnessing their necessary consequences.

The moral law is founded upon truths directly opposed to the so-called "self-evident truths" of the Declaration. All men are created under, or subject to the moral law, and that law makes them subject to the laws of the land, and hence government is an ordinance of God. It derives all just authority from the government of God. The moral law contains the fundamental principles of all good government. It enjoins the duties incumbent upon all men, and

thereby defines and secures the rights of all. There can be no violation of rights, unless the moral law is violated. It does not leave men to be governed by their consent. It demands obedience, and punishes disobedience. All law is founded upon existing relations. The duties which we owe to God are founded upon the relation which we sustain to Him. Those which we owe to our fellow-men are founded upon the relations which we sustain to one another. These are various. Some are relations of superiority, some of equality, and others of inferiority. We find especially mentioned those of parents and children, of husband and wife, of masters and slaves, or servants—just such as Abraham had, born in his house, or bought with his money—and those of neighbors. Thus we have all the family relations upon which is founded family government, which is first in order, and the most important of all. It is that into which, and under which, every human being is born. All authority rightly exercised over man by man, is delegated by God. The moral law, as expounded in the Bible, is the true charter of all human governments. The family government is, of all, the most absolute; and this results from the absolute dependence of the child upon the parent, and the superior capacity of the parent to provide for, protect, and govern the child. Thus, instead of being born free, every one is born under the most absolute government. From this he passes into that of the state, at such an age as the state may judge him capable of conducting himself under the laws of the state. He must be trained up and qualified for the state government. His right, therefore, to pass from the family into the state government, is founded upon the supposition of his fitness to pass from the one into the other. Thus man's right to self-government is founded upon his capacity for self-government. Beyond this, he has no right. Slavery is the next most absolute form of government. It is another form of household government, and next in importance to it. It is

founded upon the same great principle, that of dependence on the one hand, and superiority on the other; the incapacity of the slave to provide for, protect, and govern himself, and the capacity of the master to do these for him. Among the most enlightened and intelligent portion of the human race, more than one-half of the population consist of minors, and on an average, at least one-half of man's existence is one of minority, during which he is under the most absolute government. If such is the government which God has ordained for the greater portion of the most intelligent and enlightened races, during more than half their existence, why should it be thought unreasonable or unjust that the same absolute government should be ordained for those savage tribes who never, so far as the capacity of self-government is concerned, pass from a state of minority? Now this is precisely the case with the tribes of Africa. For more than three thousand years they have never passed from a state of minority. They have never been capable of instituting laws and government, in any proper sense; have never been able to provide for, protect, and govern themselves. There have, indeed, arisen among them superstitious usages and customs, making their wretched life more wretched still, but nothing like government administered upon any principles of right and justice. Barbarian chiefs have cut their way by violence to a kind of supremacy over the hordes they have controlled. But their normal condition is that of servitude. It is proven by their history for more than three thousand years, and by experiments made, under the most favorable circumstances, to enable them to exercise self-government. Nor will Liberia, in the end, prove any thing to the contrary. The idea that the negroes are capable of exercising a higher degree of self-government, by maintaing a republican form of government, than the most enlightened and refined nations of Europe, can find a resting-place only in the brain of a fanatic. Whether slavery could ever have arisen in

an unfallen world, is a question of no practical moment. It has arisen among a fallen race, is one of the modes of human government, and as such, has received the divine sanction and authorization. No censure is pronounced upon it in the Old Testament or the New; and it is recognized equally with the family and the state; the duties which belong to it are enjoined, as it respects both masters and servants; and no word is said or written of its being a sin or an evil to be abated, or to come to its end in any future age of the Church or the world. It has, therefore, a divine sanction throughout the Scriptures. Many Abolitionists have, therefore, rejected both the Bible and the God of the Bible. From the remarks already made, the reasons for instituting it are manifest. The family government, although the most absolute, is of all others the most perfect, the most important, and productive of the greatest amount of blessings and happiness to the human family. Next to it is that of the household government connected with domestic servitude. It brings the ruler and the subject directly together. It identifies their interests, and excites mutual sympathies. It establishes new relations, creates new duties and obligations, and opens a wider field for the exercise of the social, moral, and intellectual feelings. Hence the self-sacrificing devotion with which even delicate females attend upon their sick servants. Next to their own offspring, they are part of their household, with whom they have been associated, perhaps from infancy. Hence, too, the remarkable instances of devotion on the part of servants to their masters. No such interest is felt in the hireling or his family. In the hour of sickness or want, these are either turned over to the poor-house, or left to the cold charities of the world. No poor-houses are needed for the slaves in the South. And whatever may be their vices, such is the watchful care over them, and the restraints of the household government, that fewer of those crimes that fill jails and penitentiaries with criminals are committed by

them than by any other class of society. So far as slavery has existed in nations having the true religion, the design of a merciful God has been too evident to be mistaken. Among the Hebrews, it probably brought more men of heathen birth into a saving acquaintance with God and his truth, than any system of propagandism the ancient Church put forth. And he must be blind who does not see that, though not thus designed by man, the system of modern slavery, as existing here, was meant by God to be a great moral machinery to separate the heathen from their idols, and from the degrading customs, manners, and vices of idolatry, transferring slaves from brutal and savage to humane and civilized masters, removing them from the obscene rites and ceremonies of degrading superstitions, and placing them amid the influences of civilized life, as the most effectual means of converting them from a savage to a civilized state, and from the superstitions of idolatry to the worship of the true God. The four millions of slaves in the Southern States possess a greater amount of intelligence, piety, and happiness, and contribute more, by their industry, to the progress of humanity, than the sixty millions in Africa. Thus African slavery in the Southern States has proven to be, in the providence of God, a great moral agency, accomplishing more in civilizing and Christianizing the heathens of Africa, than all the missionary efforts of Christendom have done for that people. The reason is obvious. It makes the heathen support and civilize himself, while he is brought under the transforming influence of the Gospel. Though the human agents have had none but selfish ends in the transfer of these servants to a Christian land, the results, unintended by man, have been wonderful, in the providence of God. It has shown itself to be in accordance with the constitution of man and the laws of God. Man's development, whether physical, intellectual, or moral, is through the exercise of his faculties. Man is to live by the sweat of his brow. He is also to *strive* to

enter into the kingdom of heaven. Yet he is saved by grace, and not by works. The African lives in violation of the laws of God and of human progress. But the religion and philanthropy of the present day, sadly impregnated with infidelity, says, Clothe and feed the savage to civilize him, and preach to him to convert him; but do not separate him from his idols, from the companions of his idolatry, from the obscene, the cruel, and degrading rites of his superstitions; do not interfere with his ease by requiring him to work; do not violate his rights by subjecting him to the restraints of law; rather let him go naked and feed upon the most loathsome food, than compel him to labor for such clothing and food as are used by civilized people. To place him under such laws and restraints as his savage nature requires, is slavery—is such an injustice that, if the Bible sanctions it, it must be rejected; and if the God of the Bible has authorized it, we must make another God; for "all men are created free and equal." How true it is that God seeth not as man seeth. The most remarkable phenomenon of the present century is, that the greater portion of the civilized world should worship an imaginary, indefinable something which they call liberty, and should engage in cutting one another's throats to secure this imaginary thing, of which scarcely any two have the same idea.

The learned German, Lieber, in his treatise on Civil Liberty, has entered into a labored attempt to define, or rather to explain, what civil liberty is, for he seems to doubt about its being a definable term. He comes, however, to the conclusion, that "it is rational to speak of ancient, mediæval, or modern liberty, of Greek or Roman, Anglican or Gallican, pagan and Christian, American and English liberty." The learned author has discovered quite a variety of *liberties*. For if they are all the same, it is not very rational to speak of them as of so many different kinds. If we will discard infidel philosophy, and come to the Bible

and reality, we may arrive at some truth, both profitable and practical. Liberty simply means doing as one pleases. Every one has the right to do as he or she pleases, just so far as he or she may please to do right, but no one has a right to do wrong. Right implies a rule of acting. The moral law is that rule in all civilized nations. That law is applicable to all the relations of man. It is the duty of every man to observe that law, and, so far as self-preservation and the well-being of society is concerned, to compel others to observe it. God enjoins this upon him, and thus human government is an ordinance of God. The law of self-preservation and self-interest prompts men to enforce this injunction. It is the duty of every man to assist in arresting the murderer, the robber, or thief, and to restrain the liberty of those who do not choose to do right. The duty of individuals is varied by the different relations they sustain. All those relations are right and proper which are recognized by the moral law. Among these is that of master and servant, or slave. Every one is free just in so far as his will is in harmony with the moral law—so far as he chooses to do his duty. The servant who does his duty freely, is just as free as his master; and more free, if the master does his from compulsion. True freedom is peculiar to no condition of life. The moral law presupposes all the various conditions of life. It knows of no inalienable rights, except that of doing right. It demands obedience, without any reference to the consent of man. The declaration that "all men are created, or born, free and equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and the dogma that man can only be righfully governed by his own consent, as received and understood by the great mass of the people, are subversive of every precept in the decalogue. Infidel in their origin, they are practically atheistic—ignoring the divine government—and incompatible with the existence of all government. They assert

equality in opposition to that inequality and diversity which constitute the relations upon which the moral law is founded. They assert a freedom in opposition to that state of subjection to law in which man is born. They claim for man a liberty without any reference to his depravity and incapacity for self-government; and assert that to be inalienable which is to be acquired only as the reward of intelligence and virtue, and which history proves to be attainable only by the most enlightened and virtuous. They demand for human laws the consent of man, instead of the authority of God. The *right to do right* includes all the inalienable rights of man.

The moral law, summarily expressed in the decalogue, is the only perfect and authoritative rule of action. It is founded upon the constitution of things which God has established. It embraces all the relations of human beings, as established by God himself. To assert that any of these relations is sinful, is to assert that God is the author of sin. To set up abstract principles as self-evident and fundamental principles of government, which are incompatible with the constitution of things, and with the relations which God has established, and upon which the moral law is founded, and by which the divine government is directed, and subordinate to which all human governments should be regulated, is to sap the foundations of theology, morality, and all good government. In vain may it be alleged that abstractions can do no harm. Abstractions, when true, are the great universal truths which must govern men; when false, they are most pernicious. Did time permit, it would be easy to point out the connexion between the political and theological heresies of the present century. That Adam could not be the representative of his posterity, because they were not there to give their consent, "the great principles of human nature," which, according to Barnes, are paramount in authority to the Bible, the "higher law doctrine," the "bone theology" of Harriet B. Stowe, the

"intuitive theology" of Theodore Parker and others, the demand for an anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery God, are all the outgrowth of these self-evident truths in the Declaration of Independence. Abolitionism, Fourierism, Communism, Woman's-Rightsism, Free-Loveism, and Mormonism, and Agrarianism, too clearly betray their paternity to require any remark. They have all had their share in bringing about a general state of corruption in religion, morals, and politics, and in paving the way for a great revolution. None but a demoralized, and almost demonized people could have been led into one of the most terrible wars waged against equal, free, and independent States, who asked only to be let alone; a war which, however distinguished by calling it a war for the Constitution, the Union, the Stars and Stripes, is one of murder and plunder.

Nor have we in the South been free from guilt in this matter. We, too, ignored the moral law as the only correct charter of human rights and duties. We endorsed the same falsehoods and political heresies. We joined in the shout to the infidel goddess of Liberty. We pronounced slavery an evil, but excused ourselves on various grounds, such as that we were not the authors of it, and that its removal was impracticable: not considering that in our fallen world, and to this class of men, it might be, and is, a positive good. It did not seem to have occurred to us that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice in all matters. We did not accept the institution of slavery as an ordinance of God, and we neither defended it nor regulated it as such. We tried it by the tenets of an infidel philosophy, and the sentiment of a civilized world, perverted by the same. If slavery is wrong, then is the Bible wrong. Many Abolitionists have had logic enough to see this, and have rejected the Bible. But this does not help them out of the difficulty, for the Bible is in harmony with the constitution of things, with the diversity of relations actually existing. If they reject the Bible, and the God of the Bible, they

must also reject the God of creation. In short, they must land in atheism, and join Satan and the fallen spirits in their rebellion against God and the divine government. And these are the ranks into which the isms of the North have brought, to so large an extent, the people of the North. Under the delusion of contending for the rights of man on the part of some, and the lust of power and plunder on the part of others, they are engaged in a war in which they are violating every precept of the decalogue. Before them there is a most fearful retribution.

We, the people of these Confederate States, by the appointment of days of fasting and prayer, and thanksgiving, acknowledge the divine government. Surely the failure of every government set up in opposition to the divine government, should admonish us of the sin and folly of attempting to establish a government upon any other principles than those of the moral law. What precept is there in the decalogue which we can reject, without endangering the stability of government? Who can tell the amount of moral and political corruption and degradation produced in the United States by the open and public violation of the Sabbath? Who can say how much influence open and public profaneness and vulgarity have had in producing a contempt for law and government, and leading to deeds of lawlessness and violence? What has caused our people of the South, at any time, to have any misgivings as to the justice, safety, and permanence of our domestic institution, but the fact that we did not receive it as an ordinance of God, and regulate it as required by the moral law—by the Bible? What has brought upon us our present calamities, but a disregard of the moral law in our government? The psalmist has declared, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Solomon has said, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Who will assert the contrary? That the Lord reigns, that He is the ONE LAWGIVER, that the divine government is supreme; that

all human governments must be subordinate to the divine, that all infidel theories, axioms, and philosophy on government must be rejected, and the Bible be received as the only rule of faith and practice in law and government, is the great truth which must be acknowledged and accepted, before there can be stability in government or peace among men, we most solemnly believe. It would seem that the present contest was designed to scourge the so-called Christian and civilized world for the infidelity incorporated and mixed up with governments. France and England, as well as the United States, have rejected the Bible as the great charter of human rights. They have imbibed the philosophy of infidelity, and fanatics have come up among them like the frogs of Egypt. It will bring upon them, as well as upon the United States, the judgments of God. When Christendom has abandoned its idols; when men have ceased impiously to assert what God ought *to be* and *to do;* when they humbly acknowledge that they are born the heirs of depravity and the slaves of sin; that the only way to freedom and happiness is conformity to His laws; that the relations which God has established are all proper and right, and all equally compatible with freedom and happiness; that the forms of government can bestow upon men neither the one nor the other; and that the observance of the moral law, involving all the duties and obligations of men, and securing all their rights, shall be supreme; then, and not till then, may we expect "peace upon earth and good will toward men." We see no reason why the relation of master and servant may not continue as long as the world stands. Most assuredly it will, so long as there are inferior races, whose normal condition is that of domestic servitude, and whose incapacity for establishing and maintaining government unfits them for any other condition. It is the decree of God, that all men shall be under law and government; and that all laws and governments shall be subordinate to the divine government, and He will over-

throw and destroy them until they are thus subordinate. The institution of domestic servitude is, like that of the family government, one of His own appointment, designed for the civilization of the heathen. The Coolie system is one of heartless piracy, seizing upon the labor, and rejecting the obligations and duties of domestic servitude. It provides for neither the young, the sick, nor the old. It has nothing in it to call forth the sympathies of the master, or create attachment on the part of the slave, misnamed apprentice. It must result in the accumulation of paupers and criminals. Its only result is to produce degeneracy and increase human suffering. And this is the system that infidelity and hypocrisy would substitute for that of domestic servitude, ordained of God to mitigate the sufferings of human beings, by placing them under the household government, as best adapted to their improvement and happiness.

In the end of this contest the wickedness and folly of man will be seen, and the wisdom and goodness of God will be vindicated. Let us do our duty to all men, vindicate our institutions, defend our rights, and feel assured that the Judge of all the earth will do right.

ARTICLE III.

DOES CHRIST REQUIRE THAT BAPTISM SHALL BE ADMINISTERED BY IMMERSION?

A reply from a Pastor to an inquirer sincerely desiring to know what duty requires him to do.

My Dear Sir: Your communication is before me. In it you express the hope, that the great change which fits you for membership in the Church of Christ has been effected in your heart by the grace of God. You state that your mind is laboring under difficulties concerning the mode in which Christ requires you to receive the ordinance of baptism, and express a purpose to investigate the subject candidly, until you shall become satisfied that you have discovered what duty requires you to do. In the prosecution of your purpose, you have presented certain questions which you request me to answer. Your determination to investigate is commendable, and I wish it were more common among those whose minds do not possess that amount of information on this subject which would enable them to form an enlightened judgment. The questions you present are proper rather as preliminary to the main questions, than as being directly connected with them. They are eminently proper at the commencement of your inquiry, and the answer to them will tend, I hope, to dispose your mind favorably towards the further investigations to which your purpose will lead. In all such questions, truth should be our only aim, and its cause need never fear a candid search, however thorough. My sincere desire is to know it myself, and to teach it, and it alone, to others. In the answer I shall give to your inquiries, it can no more be my true interest to lead you into error, than it can be yours to embrace error under my false

teaching. Let us each, therefore, weigh well both what we teach and what we receive.

I. Your first question is, "Ought we to be influenced, in forming our judgment of the mode in which Christ requires us to receive the ordinance of baptism, by what is said to be the ludicrous appearance presented by the subjects of immersion as they come dripping from the water, or by what is said to be the frequent occurrence of incidents giving ground for remarks inconsistent with the solemnity and sacredness of the ordinance?"

The answer to this question seems perfectly plain. Ridicule can never be rightly regarded as a test of truth. The most sacred things have been ridiculed, and the most vile eulogized. But the ridicule heaped upon that which was sacred did not change its character or detract from its merit, and the eulogy pronounced upon that which was vile did not mend its morals or purge away its vileness. Ridicule is no evidence that that which is ridiculed is wrong, nor is eulogy any evidence that that which is eulogized is right. The mere fact that ridiculous remarks are made concerning the appearance of persons who are the subjects of immersion, as they come from the water, should hinder no one from receiving the ordinance in that way, if such reception is actually required. Nor is the fact that it is often inconvenient, and attended with trouble, to be regarded as a good reason for changing the form of the ordinance, if it is a settled point that Christ requires it to be administered by immersion, and in that way alone. If it can be shown that such is his requirement, no amount of ridicule, and no amount of inconvenience attending its administration, can authorize any change in its form. This much we cheerfully concede. But at the same time we claim that if Christ has not positively enjoined its administration in that form, the fact that it does seem calculated to excite some degree of mirth, where only serious feelings should occupy the mind,

is a valid objection to that mode of administering it, when other modes, having equal or greater claims to divine authority, are free from that objection. If Christ has appointed an ordinance which may be administered in such a manner as will not expose it to ridicule, and will not be liable to become productive of incidents tending to excite mirthful feelings in those who witness it, we have no right to burden it with a form of administration which is productive of occurrences tending to excite such feelings and call forth such remarks. That the mode of baptism by immersion is prolific of such incidents, is evident to any one who has been a frequent attendant at such places. And if occurrences tending to excite mirth are seen, the levity of deportment and feelings which is so often witnessed in the attending audience, will be inevitable. In addition to this, it has often appeared to me that in administering immersion to females there is, at times, an approach to indelicacy, undesigned by either party, but arising necessarily from the circumstances of the case. If such occasions can be avoided without violating the law or impairing the significance of the ordinance, a proper sense of propriety would lead to such administration of it as would avoid them. We are not at liberty to shrink from duty to avoid reproach; but at the same time it is wrong to perform duty in such a manner as will provoke reproach unnecessarily, when it can be as well or better performed in a manner which will not expose it to that objection. Where it can be done, we are to discharge our duty in such a manner as not to let "our good be evil spoken of." We have no right to add burdens to the cross, in order that we may claim especial merit for fidelity and courage in meeting and bearing them. Thus far, then, our minds may rightly be influenced by this objection. If we are satisfied that Christ has appointed immersion as the form in which He requires us to receive baptism, we are not at liberty to decline it. But if we are not satisfied that such obligation

IMPERFECT IN ORIGINAL

binds us to receive it in that manner, we may rightly prefer another mode.

II. Your second inquiry is, "Does not the fact that such objections are made by the opponents of immersion, justly expose them to the charge of shrinking from it on account of the humiliation to which they must submit in receiving baptism in that manner?"

I am gratified that I have an opportunity of meeting this charge, as I am aware it is one which is often brought against us, though less frequently now than formerly. The advocates of immersion are by no means sparing in dealing out denunciations against us for shrinking, as they say, because of improper motives, from that for meeting which with great courage and self-denial, they very liberally commend themselves. Perhaps we would not be so suspicious of their motives in condemning us, were they a little more sparing in commending themselves. I must say, that the manner in which I have invariably heard our fault in this matter presented by them, in dark contrast with what they claim as their own shining virtue, has impressed me with the opinion, that they were not so much pained by our short-coming in duty as they were pleased with the opportunity which it gave them to present themselves in shining contrast with our failure. I venture to assert that no man has ever heard them condemn us, in any public place, without either expressing or plainly implying a commendation of themselves for practising the virtue in which they represent us as so deficient. Those who refuse to receive immersion are represented as refusing to receive it because they are too proud to submit to a form of baptism which has in it so much that is humiliating. Those who do submit to it in that form are commended for their courage and fidelity in exhibiting before the world so bright an example of Christian humility. Now, if their charge against us can be shown to be just, I have not a word to say, in the way of complaint, against the severity

with which we are condemned. But if it is wholly without foundation, as I think it can be clearly shown to be, their denunciations rather excite suspicions of a want of charity in them than they do of humility in us.

Their charge is that we shrink from submission to baptism by immersion, because the ordinance, in that form, is too humiliating for us to bear. Your inquiry is: Do we not justly expose ourselves to this, by advancing such objections against immersion as are referred to in your first inquiry? Let me ask, where is the ground on which they base this charge? What is the evidence that we shrink from it, through unworthy fear of the reproach connected with it? And in what does the great humiliation of baptism by immersion consist? This is a question we have often asked of those who so freely reproach us with the charge of pride, but have never yet received an answer. With a sincere desire to judge candidly and righteously, we are bound to say that we can discover nothing in it whatever of the nature of Christian humility, more than is to be found in any other mode of making a public profession of faith in Christ. On the contrary, we assert our belief that the manner in which the subjects of immersion are paraded before the crowds who come to witness the exhibition, has a tenfold greater tendency to cultivate pride than humility. What must be the effect of being drawn out before a crowd to submit to what they are taught is an act of humiliation which it requires great courage to meet? I am greatly mistaken if the weakness of the human heart can, under such circumstances, escape the temptation of applying to itself quite liberally the flattering unction of self-commendation for possessing such an amount of Christian courage as is necessary to meet boldly the humiliation which they are taught is so closely connected with the act they are about to perform. Were there any real humiliation in the act, it would be different. But there really is none. The subject may suffer some discomfort, and be

IMPERFECT IN ORIGINAL

made the mark of some silly witticism from the irreverent crowd; but what is all that? Is every discomfort an act of great Christian humiliation? No man can live the life of a consistent Christian, who does not, hundreds of times in an ordinary life-time, submit to far greater trials than that of immersion, without ever once thinking that there is any especial humiliation in what he is doing. An act of true Christian humility will always exert a healthful influence on the heart. But the evil in this case is, that they who submit to immersion are taught to believe that the act of submitting is itself an act of humility, when in truth it has nothing of that nature in it. The consequence of this false teaching is, that they form an erroneous opinion of the nature of Christian humility, and attribute to an outward act that virtue which belongs to the internal state of the heart, and to it alone. Man's whole religious history shows that the outward acts of the body, even where great and long-continued pain is required, are easily performed. It is to obtain the internal conformity of the mind to the will of God, which constitutes the great difficulty. There is always, therefore, great danger, when any outward act or form is unduly brought forward into a prominence to which it has no just claim, and the outward compliance with it is insisted upon as a matter of great importance. The danger is, that the human mind will rest satisfied with compliance with the outward form, while it fails to discover the superior importance of that obligation which requires the inward conformity of the mind of which the outward form is only the symbol. We think, therefore, that they who so severely censure us for unworthily shrinking from a form to which we believe they attach undue importance, are themselves in great danger of falling into the grievous error of formalism. True enough, we refuse to receive immersion as the only lawful form of baptism; but we assign reasons for our refusal, which, in all honesty, we believe fully justify us in the course we take. We do not believe that Christ has

commanded the ordinance to be administered in that particular way, and in it alone; and as that form of administering it is liable to what we think are serious objections, and is found so unsuitable to the condition of many pious professors of religion that it must be either changed to some other form or omitted, and is also found so unsuited to extreme northern climates that it is impossible to practise it in them during a large part of every year, as will be seen in my answer to your next inquiry, we think it is better to choose a form of administering it which is suited to all to whom Christ directed it to be administered. The form which we adopt we believe to be that which the Scriptures teach, and that which most appropriately teaches what the ordinance is intended to represent. Our lives show all the evidence of true religion which is shown by those who so severely condemn us as failing to meet the requirements which faithfulness to our vows of consecration demand. Our minds are as clear and as capable of judging as those who hold the opposite opinion. It can not be that there is any thing in the act of immersion from which we shrink. We have shown a willingness to obey commands of Christ far more trying than this. There are those among us who would not count their lives dear, if required to lay them down in the service of their Master. And shall they be told that they shrink because they are unwilling to submit to the humiliation of immersion? There are those among us who give a good testimony in every trial to which they are exposed, and shall they be told that they are ashamed to meet that reproach of the cross which immersion requires? Never was there a charge more utterly unfounded. Does not the language which the advocates of immersion often use when making these charges against us justify us in thinking that, in the estimation of many of them, submission to immersion is the main burden of the Christian cross? And are they not in danger of substituting humiliation of the body, by subject-

ing it to what they are pleased to regard as a humiliating external ordinance, for humiliation of the soul, by subjecting it to the authority of God, and accepting salvation through Christ, without any claim to merit of its own?

It can not be necessary to pursue this subject farther. A charge made without any fact on which it can rest, supported by nothing but assertion, can require but little to be said in refuting it. Until they can show us something in immersion which requires Christian self-denial greater than any other form of publicly professing Christ, they can claim no merit in submitting to that which we refuse. And until they can show a want of fidelity and courage in us in bearing the cross of Christ, and meeting its reproach, they can have no just ground for charging us with shrinking, through unworthy motives, from that which we believe Christ has not commanded. I am happy in believing that this charge is now much less frequently made than in former times. It is my impression that few, if any, except those grossly ignorant on the subject on which they speak, will venture at this day to bring it forward against us. We may, therefore, leave it, with other calumnies, to die under the happy influences of that increasing light which we trust is rising on our world.

III. Your third inquiry is, "To what extent should we be influenced, in forming our judgment of the mode in which Christ appointed baptism to be administered, by what are stated to be the inconveniences of immersion, especially its unsuitableness to the condition of those in feeble health, and to those living in northern climates?"

This inquiry I regard as presenting matter of more importance than those to which our attention has been already called. Did the inconvenience amount to nothing more than the petty annoyance of unpleasant feelings from wet garments, it might pass with little notice. In many cases, however, it becomes a very serious question, and rises to the importance not only of inconvenience, but of pro-

hibition from the privileges of the ordinance. In ascertaining what act Christ requires to be done in fulfilling his command, we may certainly claim for Him the right to have His command interpreted in such a manner as will render all its parts consistent with each other, and with the end for which it was given; and, therefore, that that which was commanded to be done shall be suited to the condition of those to whom the act was directed to be applied. To suppose that Christ would appoint an ordinance, and then select the class to whom He would direct it to be administered, and yet make it of such a character that it would be found wholly unsuited to a part of that class, would be an imputation on His wisdom and consistency, which can not be permitted. In interpreting His command, we are therefore bound to receive as the act commanded one which we can regard as proper to be applied to all those to whom His command requires it to be administered. And no act which it would be manifestly improper to administer to any part of them, can be the act which He appointed. In determining to whom His ordinance is to be administered, we have but one guide, His word. By the command of Christ, baptism is to be administered to all who profess their faith in Him, with repentance for sin. By the terms of this command, no condition in which men are placed debars them from their privilege. It would seem passing strange that Christ should issue a command, in one part of which He instructs His apostles to administer baptism to all who credibly profess their faith in Him, and in the other part of the same command instructs them to administer it in such a form that a large number of these must be debarred from the privilege of receiving it. Many cases occur in which persons make a profession of religion when sick, and with little, if any, hope that they will ever recover. In not a few cases, the probability is that they may linger for months, or even years, confined to their rooms, or even to their beds. If they believe on

Christ, according to His instructions, they have a right to receive baptism, and His ministers are commanded to administer it to them. If, then, they are also commanded to administer it by immersion, they must administer it in such a way as will, in many cases, endanger the life of the subject. Should a physician be called to administer medicine in a case of extreme sickness, and knowing the condition of his patient, should so administer to him as to take his life, he would be guilty of high crime, by the laws of all civilized communities. Should a minister of the Gospel administer baptism so as to destroy the life of its subject, he would be equally guilty. To present the point I am urging in a clear, practical light, let me state a few cases which bring the issue of this question fairly before us. The first case I will present occurred in my own ministry. The commencement of my ministerial life was in a county in the western part of Virginia, having a thin population, scattered along the valleys, between mountain ridges. At the Court-House was a small village, where I had one of my regular appointments. Among the attendants on my preaching at this place were two sisters, who were said to be members of a different branch of the Church from that with which I am connected. They were spoken of uniformly as consistent Christians, and, by their deportment, maintained a reputation for piety which was unquestioned. They attended my communion seasons, and, on invitation to the members of other churches, united in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Having, after a time, made a change in my field of labor, that point was visited only occasionally. On all these occasions, those two sisters were regular in their attendance at the place of preaching, and at the communion table. Passing through the village once, I designed making a stay of only a few hours, but was providentially detained, so that I was under the necessity of spending the night there. In the afternoon I was told those two ladies were ill, and designed calling to visit them, but

was prevented by other engagements. Having determined to call and see them in the morning, before leaving the place, I retired to rest. About midnight, I was waked by the gentleman with whom I lodged, who told me that those ladies had just learned that I was in the village, and desired that I would visit them immediately. I went to their home, and found them very low, but perfectly rational, and in a state of mind entirely comfortable on every subject except one. After full and satisfactory conversation, one of them addressed me thus: "Now, sir, if you are satisfied with the evidence which we have given you of a saving change in our hearts, we have one request to make of you. We have been in communion with the church with which we have been connected for several years; but, through our own negligence, have never informed our minister that we have not been baptized. We have but a short time to live, and do not feel willing to die in the continued neglect of a duty commanded by Christ. We have no expectation that baptism will of its own virtue do us any good, but feel that it is a neglected duty which we desire to discharge before life closes. Will you baptize us, and give us the satisfaction of knowing that we have complied with the command of Christ, before we close our eyes on life?" The case appeared clear, and without hesitation I told them I would; and there, after the hour of midnight, as Paul and Silas in the prison at Philippi baptized the jailor and his family, so I, in the family room of the county jail, baptized the jailor's daughters. One of them lived only a few days, and died in peace; the other lingered a few weeks, and then, with great comfort of mind, followed her sister into the unseen world. Neither of them left their room until they were carried out by those who carried them to their graves. But little comment on this case is needed. Did I judge rightly in believing that the command of Christ made it my duty to baptize these two ladies? In deciding this question, I had no right, and no need, to look to any thing but my

commission. That commission gave me two things to do—preach the Gospel and administer baptism. It specified distinctly to whom each of these acts was to be done. Preach the Gospel to every people; administer baptism to those who believe. Under this commission, I had no more right to withhold the administration of baptism from any part of those who gave satisfactory evidence of belief in Christ, than I had to withhold the preaching of the Gospel from a part of those to whom God, in His providence, had sent me. No clearer evidence of faith in Christ could be produced in any case than that which was presented before me. I have given the narrative in full, for the purpose of placing this point beyond question. If any case could occur in which my commission would make it my duty to administer baptism, it was here before me. This no man can pretend to deny. But what I was required to do, I was required to do by the command of Christ. Did Christ require me to do an act wholly unsuited to the condition of those to whom it was to be done? If His command in my commission required me to immerse them, humanity required me to disobey it. This charge against Him we can never permit. The act which my commission required me to do must certainly be proper to be done to those to whom He directed me to do it. That act could not be immersion, and it must be such other application of water to the subjects as suited their condition. If this is not the case, then we are bound to make the charge that Christ appointed an ordinance, and specified the class to whom it was to be applied, and yet made it of such a nature as was wholly improper to be applied to many of the very class to whom he directed it to be administered. This can not be.

But let us take another case. The occurrence I am about to state took place many years ago, in the city of Richmond, during the ministry of Dr. John H. Rice. I have it from unquestioned authority. There was laboring

in the city at that time a Baptist minister, whose name, also, was Rice. In his pastoral services he was called to visit a man in a state of extreme sickness. After a time the invalid obtained a comfortable hope of pardoned sin and reconciliation with God. As was natural, he desired to unite himself with the people of God by the bond of visible connexion with His Church. Here was a difficulty. To form that bond, the man must be baptized. But, according to the opinion of the Baptist minister, baptism was immersion, and nothing but immersion. But to immerse the man would take his life. He earnestly desired to be admitted into the Church of God, and partake of the emblems of the broken body and shed blood of the Saviour before he died. But he could not be immersed; that was settled. The dilemma was an awkward one. The man applying for admission into the Church gave satisfactory evidence of saving faith in Christ. He earnestly desired the privilege to which his faith entitled him. What right had the minister to withhold it from him? In obedience to Christ's command in his commission, he had preached the Gospel to this dying sinner. In obedience to that Gospel which he had heard, the sinner had professed his faith in Jesus Christ, and now asked that the minister would perform the other act enjoined in his commission. Did Christ, in the commision of this minister, command him to baptize those who believed; and yet, when this dying sinner, through his preaching, had believed, did he find that the command of Christ was of such a nature that he could not do the other thing which it enjoined? According to the opinion of the minister, here was a case in which a man was entitled to the privilege of baptism, by a profession of faith with which he was satisfied, but the ordinance to which he was entitled was so unsuited to his condition that it could not be administered. By the instructions of Christ he had no right to withhold it, but by the voice of humanity he was forbidden to

administer it. No wonder he felt so embarrassed, by an opinion which led him into so unpleasant a dilemma, that he made a very awkward shift to get out of it. His expedient was amusing. Rice the Baptist calls upon Rice the Presbyterian, and takes him with him to visit the sick man. After full and satisfactory conversation, Rice the Presbyterian, thinking that this was a case in which his commission as a minister of Christ made it his duty to administer baptism, and thinking that the ordinance appointed by Christ was, in its nature and form, suited to the condition of all those to whom He directed it to be administered, baptized the man, and Rice the Baptist administered the communion to him. It is not my business to reconcile the contradictions between the man's act and the fundamental principles of his creed. My object is to show that the supposition that Christ commanded the administration of baptism by immersion, and in that way alone, involves a contradiction, in all such cases, between the different parts of the command. But to suppose that Christ has issued a command in which one part does, in any case, come in conflict with another, is an imputation on His character which can not be tolerated.

But let us take another case, as I find it quoted from the "Christian Index," a Baptist paper published in the city of Macon. It is so exactly in point, and so full of instruction, that I present it with only a few remarks by way of comment. The statement, I learn, is made by a Baptist minister. I give it in his own words. "A sick soldier came home, and invited the minister to visit him, to whom he related his feelings, and requested baptism. The minister informed him that he was unable to submit to it, and tried to satisfy him that the will would be taken for the deed. This did not satisfy the sick man, and he requested baptism by sprinkling, remarking that he wished to approach as near real baptism as possible. The minister, therefore, in his own language, administered the ordinance

by pouring." This statement argues its own case so strongly, that I do not know that I can add any thing to the force with which the simple facts present themselves. Several questions, however, occur to my mind, which are worthy of being pondered: 1st. When Christ commanded His disciples to baptize those who made a credible profession of faith in Him, did He make any exceptions which would authorize them to withhold the ordinance from persons in the condition of this sick soldier? 2d. If he did not make any such exceptions, by what authority do they act in refusing it when so urgently requested? 3d. Is it reasonable to believe that Christ would appoint an ordinance for the reception of members into His Church, which His ministers, in the exercise of their commission, would discover to be so unsuited to many of those making a profession of their faith that they would feel compelled, by motives of humanity, to withhold it from them? 4th. Is it not much more reasonable that we should believe that Baptists have made a mistake in their interpretation of the command of Christ, than that we should believe that Christ has appointed an ordinance which is wholly unsuited to the condition of many of those to whom His command directs it to be applied? It will be noticed that both in this instance and the previous one the persons applying for baptism were acknowledged to be entitled to it, by giving satisfactory evidence of that saving change of heart which is the only condition required by Christ. It will be noticed, also, that the only hindrance, in either case, was the weakness of the bodily condition of the applicant. Here, then, we have the point distinctly set forth, that when the grace of God had prepared these two men for receiving the ordinance of baptism, the manner in which that ordinance is administered by Baptists was found so unsuited to the condition of those acknowledged as its proper subjects, that it could not be administered. Now I ask you, is it probable that a form of the ordinance

which would be found unsuited to its proper subjects would be appointed by Christ? I can not believe that the Head of the Church would admit the penitent sick into His Church in heaven, and deny admission into that on earth, when they earnestly desire the privilege. The anxiety of these sick persons to be admitted into the Church, is nothing more than is common in such cases. Are we compelled to believe that Christ has forbidden His ministers to admit them? But if they are commanded to administer baptism by immersion, and in no other way, then are they commanded to withhold the rite of admission from all who are in a state of health too feeble to bear that ordinance. This I can not believe.

But the cases of sick persons are not the only cases which present the difficulty I have stated. There are many conditions in which men may be placed, when, according to the command of Christ, it would be the duty of His ministers to administer baptism, and yet if it must be administered by immersion, and in no other way, it must be omitted altogether, without any authority from Christ for omitting it. There are extensive tracts of country affording no natural facilities for immersion. Men may be travelling through them, and may believe on the Lord Jesus Christ: where is the authority for postponing baptism until they shall pass into a region such as will permit it to be performed by immersion? Men may be converted to Christ in prison: where is the authority for postponing baptism until they can come out and be immersed? So of all other cases of the same general character. The ordinance was evidently instituted with the intention that it should be applied to men in all conditions in which they should be placed. But in addition to this, there are whole districts where immersion is so unsuitable to the climate and condition of the people, that it can not be applied in any case without great inconvenience, and its general application is an absolute impossibility. In ex-

treme northern regions, the rigor of winter extends over nine months of the year. During this period, the cold is so intense that immersion in the open air would be attended by instant death. Their only material for building houses is frozen snow. Their only means of warming them is an oil lamp. Water for domestic purposes is obtained by melting snow over their lamps, and over them their cooking is all done. The ministers of Christ are commanded to go into that country and preach the Gospel. When men there believe on Christ, it becomes the duty of His ministers to baptize them. Are they required to immerse them? What would be necessary for this? First, a vessel of sufficient size to immerse a man in must be obtained. It is questionable whether the whole resources of the country would furnish such a vessel. Their domestic wants never demand one so large. But suppose it to be furnished, what is still wanting? They must melt a sufficient quantity of snow over the lamp; and as they have no large vessels for that purpose, it must be accomplished by melting as much as the small vessel used will contain, as many times as will be necessary to fill the large one in which the immersion is to be performed. But were this all, perhaps it could be accomplished, and although the difficulty and inconvenience would be great, yet they might be overcome. It must be remembered, however, that the cold is so intense, even in their snow houses, that the thermometer stands many degrees below the freezing point, and to accomplish the desired purpose, they must have the means not only of melting the water in the small vessel, but of keeping it from freezing in the large one. I do not believe that the utmost resources within their reach would enable them to do it. Their mode of life is simple; their family utensils are small, and such as they can carry from place to place, as they move about in search of food; their country is barren and frozen, and they are abjectly poor. Were they to attempt such a

thing, with the best means they could procure, the water in the large vessel must become solid ice before a sufficient quantity could be melted in the small ones used for that purpose. Let any advocate of immersion imagine the difficulties which he would have to encounter in immersing a subject under the circumstances under which a Greenlander must do it, or even with no greater degree of cold than that which often prevails along the northern border of the United States during the rigor of winter. Let him imagine himself in a snow hut, surrounded by his subjects, waiting, not for the moving of the water, but for its melting. He has no fuel for warming but an oil lamp. He has no vessel for heating but a copper bowl. His bath for immersing is ready. He has filled his bowl, and placed it over the lamp. Slowly it sinks, until it is melted and poured into the bath. Again it is filled and melted. But the cold is intense. His shivering subjects are watching the tedious process with chattering teeth. He takes the second bowlful to empty it into the bath, when, alas! he finds the first is solid ice. Now, I ask any man of common sense and reason, if he can honestly say that he believes the merciful Saviour of men has commanded any man either to immerse or be immersed under such circumstances. I am not ignorant of the fact that the advocates of immersion claim that, practically, they have no serious difficulty on this score. The Rev. Mr. Willet, from Wisconsin, is quoted as saying, at one of their recent anniversaries: "Than Wisconsin, there is not a nobler field for Baptists. He had led them up out of the rivers when the thermometer stood ten degrees below zero, with icicles four or five inches long hanging from their heavy whiskers. But they looked good as they came up, and their faces shone." Let any man capable of judging say whether these are the words of a man in the possession of his sober senses; or are they not plainly those of one who has delivered himself over to the power of a delusion? Can

such declarations have any other effect than to shock the senses of all sober-minded people, and convince them of the necessity of resisting the system which leads to such extravagant absurdities. I will not say that ministers could not be found strong enough in enduring cold to do what he says he has done. Nor will I say that there are not some who might be found able to bear immersion in weather so intensely cold. But how many men are there in the membership of every denomination of Christians who could not bear it? And how many ministers are there, even in the Baptist church, to whom it would be an absolute sacrifice of life to be required to administer the ordinance under such circumstances? And how long could any man continue to perform such service?

You notice that the ground which I have been contending for is, that as the ordinance which Christ appointed was intended for all, so the form in which it was appointed to be administered was suited to all. And the objection I have been urging against immersion is, that it gives to the ordinance of baptism, which was intended for all, a form under which it can be administered to only a part. This I contend is plainly a violation of the appointment of Christ, who must, in consistency with Himself, have given to His ordinance a form in which it would be proper for His ministers to apply it to each individual of the whole class to whom he directed it to be applied. And, even admitting that there may be some ministers whose constitutional vigor enables them to administer baptism by immersion in the intensely cold winter climate of Wisconsin, and that there may be some subjects who are able to bear the administration of it in that form, yet how many ministers, and how many subjects, are there who are not able to bear it? I suppose I hazard little in expressing the belief that fully one-half the members of every church would be kept out of it by the conscientious sense of the superior duty of protecting their lives, were they compelled to be admit-

ted by receiving the ordinance under such circumstances as this minister informs us he had administered it. And unquestionably a very large number of the ministers of every church would be debarred from the privilege of discharging that part of their duty which requires them to baptize those that believe, were they compelled to do it in the open air, with the thermometer ten degrees below zero. Is it, therefore, reasonable that we shall be required to believe that Christ has appointed for those living in that climate an ordinance by which they are to be admitted into His Church, to which perhaps not more than one-half can submit, and which a large portion of His ministers can not apply to them, except in mild weather? It would certainly be passing strange that a thing so remarkable should be done, and yet that no intimation of it should be given, either by Christ, in His original appointment of it, or by His inspired apostles, in their administration of it. But if this objection applies with force to the climate on the northern border of the United States, where the cold is ten degrees below zero, much more strongly will it apply to regions farther north, where, for a large part of the year, it is fifty degrees below zero. But let it be remembered that Christ has not given one set of directions for one climate, and another set for a different climate. If He has commanded to immerse in the pleasant climate of Palestine, He has commanded to immerse in Greenland. And if He has not commanded to immerse in Greenland, He has not commanded to immerse any where. But if such a command, with the limited resources we have supposed, would amount to a prohibition of the ordinance during all the severely cold weather of the winter, along the northern border of the United States, it would amount to a prohibition of it during at least nine months of the year throughout all the inhabited part of Greenland, and in the whole extent of country bordering on the Arctic ocean. Suppose a man believes on the Lord Jesus at the commencement of

winter; suppose his health is declining, and he and every one else is satisfied that before the long winter shall have passed and the short summer shall have come, he must close his eyes in death; and suppose he earnestly desires to be admitted into the Church of God on earth, to bear his testimony publicly, in the way that God has appointed, by a public profession of faith, and by having placed upon him the seal of that public profession, and of his covenant with God, by the ordinance of baptism: I ask if the kind Saviour has made the ordinance which is to admit members into His Church of such a nature as must shut this man out? Has Christ made the nature of that ordinance, which was appointed to be the public seal of the admission of disciples into His Church such that in some climates it must debar them from the privilege of making a public profession during three-fourths of every year; and in some cases must cut them off entirely from the inestimable privilege for which their hearts yearn, but which they can never hope to enjoy, because, before the long lingering winter shall roll away, and the short summer, with its pleasant warmth, shall come, wasting disease will have finished its work, and they will have been carried out of life, without being permitted to perform a duty which they earnestly desired to perform, and to enjoy the inestimable privilege of uniting with the children of God on earth, in that ordinance which is the memorial of the Saviour's great work in the redemption of their souls from death? Has Christ, then, made the ordinance which was to be the seal of their admission into the Church in all such cases, the very means, and the only means, of keeping them out? For you will perceive that nothing but the supposed nature of the ordinance prevents their entrance. They have given all the evidence of faith and repentance that Christ requires. Were the nature of the ordinance of baptism such that it could be administered to them, there would be nothing to hinder their admission into the Church. But if the command requires rigidly that

it must be by immersion, then it can not be administered at all in such cases; and we have the unaccountably strange fact fixed upon us, that Christ has appointed an ordinance, and made it the duty of His ministers to apply it to all who believe in His name, under all the circumstances in which they can believe, and in all the climates in which they can live; and yet He has made the ordinance of such a nature, that in some climates it can not be administered during three-fourths of every year, and to many of those to whom He directs it to be applied, it can not be administered in any climate, without endangering their lives. I can not conceive how one thing can contradict another more flatly than this contradicts all our opinions of the perfect consistency and harmony of the several parts of the commandments and doctrines of the Saviour with each other. But this hard conclusion is a necessary consequence from the supposition that Christ requires baptism to be administered in all cases by immersion.

I have extended my remarks on this subject much beyond the bounds I had supposed a proper statement of the case would require, and yet I have only brought them to the conclusion which a just view of the facts involved in the statement required. In answering your inquiry, how far these objections to immersion should influence your mind in deciding the question whether Christ has appointed that as the mode in which the act of baptism shall be performed, I would say that I can not see how we can escape the conclusion, amounting to almost certainty, that He has made no such appointment. Yet whilst I say this, I say also, with all candor, that it is your duty to examine directly the question whether He has made such appointment. That question you should examine thoroughly. Should you desire any aid which it may be in my power to give, it will afford me pleasure to assist you. There are several questions which will claim your attention. You are aware that the advocates of immersion state confi-

dently that Christ does positively require it, and however plausible these objections may appear, yet they are only objections against a plain positive command, and can not set that command aside. Your duty is to examine whether such a command has been given; and if it has, whatever objections may be urged against it, it must be obeyed. All that I intend by what I have said is, that, from the view of the case presented, strong presumptive evidence exists that no such command has been given. Your duty is to examine the grounds on which the advocates of immersion rest their claims, and see whether they prove that such a command exists.

ARTICLE IV.

DR. THORNWELL'S MEMORIAL ON THE RECOGNITION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE CONSTITUTION.

The history of this document is as follows: At the Augusta Assembly the Committee on Bills and Overtures, consisting of F. McFarland, R. H. Chapman, J. H. Thornwell, J. A. Smylie, A. H. Caldwell, T. R. Welch, L. Tenny, and R. B. White, Ministers, and F. Johnson, J. H. Dickson, T. C. Perrin, J. Bonner, and J. Montgomery, Ruling Elders, recommended to the Assembly for their adoption, as Overture No. 7, a memorial by Dr. Thornwell, on the recognition of Christianity in the Constitution. At the same time several other Overtures were brought forward by the Committee. Dr. Chapman moved that Overture No. 7 be immediately taken up, and the following conversation is all that was put on record in the "Assembly Reporter" of the day as having taken place:

"Dr. CHAPMAN said: The Committee were unanimous in favor of it. I would move, if the paper pass, that we sign it as an entire body, and direct our Stated Clerk to send it to Congress.

"Dr. WHITE objected to the immediate consideration.

"Mr. NASH. I cordially approve of Dr. Chapman's motion, and I don't see what we can hang a debate upon. If we wish to speak on the state of the country, we can spend the night at that. But I think it will be put without debate, and unanimously adopted.

"Dr. BOCOCK. It will be of no use to send that paper to Congress. It will do no good, but a great deal of harm, and would turn out one of the Secretaries if passed.

"Dr. PRYOR. Let us adhere to the regular order of business. That last paper is a very grave one, and we are not ready to pass the paper *sub silentio*—for we are not prepared to adopt.

"MODERATOR. The motion before the house is, 'Will the Assembly take up Overture No. 7?'

"Dr. CHAPMAN. My only desire for the Assembly to take up this subject now was to save debate—to save the time of the Assembly; so that, as this document was long, we could pass on it while its logic was fresh in our minds. That paper deserves to be unanimously adopted by this body. It is of all mysteries the greatest, that God should have so long borne with a nation that utterly disowned him!

"Dr. THORNWELL. I hope Brother Chapman will withdraw his motion. If this paper is to be adopted at all, it should be done with cordiality. We ought to allow brethren to consider this subject.

"Dr. CHAPMAN. I withdraw my motion, and move to make this the special order for to-morrow evening, at 7, P. M.

"This was agreed to."

"In the evening the special order was called up.

"Dr. THORNWELL then said: I have a remark or two to make. It is now late in the session, and the principles embodied in that paper demand a full and long debate, and it would not be possible now to have such a discussion. If we had time to discuss it freely, there would be no material difference of opinion, because they are the principles of our Confession of Faith. I wish to state, in justice to myself, that the paper was not brought forward on my own private motion, but at the recommendation of the Committee. If this paper is adopted, it should be done with unanimity and cordiality, and as that appears impossible without a long discussion, I beg leave to withdraw the paper from the files of the Assembly.

"Dr. ADGER. It has been objected to this paper, that even if we should present it, it could do no good, for it would be at once

cast out of Congress. Now, sir, I happen to know a very influential member of that Congress, and not a Presbyterian, who expressed the hope that such a paper as this would be presented to the Confederate Congress, and I know that from the deference which would be paid to that member, if for no other reason, this paper would at least be entertained with respect.

"Mr. NASH. The only object which could be obtained by presenting this paper would be this: Even should we fail, we would have done one of the most sublime acts which the Church could perform. It would be preaching the Gospel in high places with emphasis. If the Gospel is not well received, are we on that account not to preach the Gospel?

"Dr. THORNWELL. I do not think that, under the circumstances in which we are placed, the Assembly is prepared to do justice to the subject. And therefore I hope that, as a personal favor to myself, I may be allowed to withdraw this paper from the files of the Assembly.

"Leave was granted."

It will be seen, therefore, that the paper was withdrawn by its author, not because of any debate had upon its merits, neither yet from any doubts he entertained about its principles, but from his feeling that in order to insure their adoption with cordiality and unanimity, a long and full consideration of them would first be necessary, which was impossible at that late period of the meeting.

At the earnest request of two Ruling Elders from Georgia, this paper was produced at the late Assembly, and is now published, in compliance with the wishes of many members, for their deliberate examination, and that of the whole Church.

JOHN B. ADGER.

MEMORIAL, ETC., ETC.

The petition of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, now met and sitting in the city of Augusta, in the State of Georgia, to the Congress of the Confederate States of America, now met and sitting in the city of Richmond, in the State of Virginia, respectfully showeth:

That this Assembly is the supreme judicatory of those Presbyterian churches in the Confederate States which were formerly under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; that it comprises ——— presbyteries, ——— synods, and ——— members; that it represents a people devotedly attached to the Confederate cause, and eminently loyal to the Confederate Government. The changes which your honorable body has made in the Constitution of the United States, and which have been ratified and confirmed by the various States of the Confederacy, have received the universal approval of the Presbyterian population of these States; and none have been more grateful to God than themselves for the prudence, caution, moderation, and wisdom which have characterized all your counsels in the arduous task of constructing the new Government. We congratulate you on your success. But, gentlemen, we are constrained, in candor, to say that, in our humble judgment, the Constitution, admirable as it is in other respects, still labors under one capital defect. It is not distinctively Christian. It is not bigotry, but love to our country, and an earnest, ardent, desire to promote its permanent well-being, which prompts us to call the attention of your honorable body to this subject, and, in the way of respectful petition, to pray that the Constitution may be amended so as to express the precise relations which the Government of these States ought to sustain to the religion of Jesus Christ.

The Constitution of the United States was an attempt to realize the notion of popular freedom, without the checks of aristocracy and a throne, and without the alliance of a national church. The conception was a noble one, but the execution was not commensurate with the design. The fundamental error of our fathers was, that they accepted a partial for a complete statement of the truth. They saw clearly the human side: that popular governments were the

offspring of popular will; and that rulers, as the servants, and not the masters of their subjects, were properly responsible to them. They failed to apprehend the divine side: that all just government is the ordinance of God, and that magistrates are His ministers, who must answer to Him for the execution of their trust. The consequence of this failure, and of exclusive attention to a single aspect of the case, was to invest the people with a species of supremacy as insulting to God as it was injurious to them. They became a law unto themselves; there was nothing beyond them to check or control their caprices or their pleasure. All were accountable to them; they were accountable to none. This was certainly to make the people a God; and if it was not explicitly expressed that they could do no wrong, it was certainly implied that there was no tribunal to take cognizance of their acts. A foundation was thus laid for the worst of all possible forms of government—a democratic absolutism—which, in the execution of its purposes, does not scruple to annul the most solemn compacts and to cancel the most sacred obligations. The will of majorities must become the supreme law, if the voice of the people is to be regarded as the voice of God; if they are, in fact, the only God whom rulers are bound to obey. It is not enough, therefore, to look upon government as simply the institute of man. Important as this aspect of the subject unquestionably is, yet if we stop there, we shall sow the seeds of disaster and failure. We must contemplate people and rulers as alike subject to the authority of God. His will is the true supreme; and it is under Him, and as the means of expressing His sovereign pleasure, that conventions are called, constitutions are framed, and governments erected. To the extent that the State is a moral person, it must needs be under moral obligation; and moral obligation, without reference to a superior will, is a flat contradiction in terms. If, then, the State is an ordinance of God, it should acknowledge the fact. If it

exists under the conditions of a law superior to all human decrees, and to which all human decrees behove to be conformed, that law should be distinctly recognized. Let us guard, in this new Confederacy, against the fatal delusion that our government is a mere expression of human will. It is, indeed, an expression of *will*, but of will regulated and measured by those eternal principles of right which stamp it at the same time as the creature and institute of God. And of all governments in the world, a confederate government, resting as it does upon plighted faith, can least afford to dispense with the supreme Guardian of treaties.

Your honorable body has already, to some extent, rectified the error of the old Constitution, but not so distinctly and clearly as the Christian people of these States desire to see done. We venture respectfully to suggest, that it is not enough for a State which enjoys the light of divine revelation to acknowledge in general terms the supremacy of God; it must also acknowledge the supremacy of His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds. To Jesus Christ all power in heaven and earth is committed. To Him every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess. He is the Ruler of the nations, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Should it be said that the subjection of governments to Jesus Christ is not a relation manifested by reason, and therefore not obligatory on the State, the answer is obvious—that duties spring not from the manner in which the relation is made known, but from the truth of the relation itself. If the fact is so, that Jesus Christ is our Lord, and we know the fact, no matter how we come to know it, we are bound to acknowledge it, and act upon it. A father is entitled to the reverence of his son, a master to the obedience of his servant, and a king to the allegiance of his subjects, no matter how the relation between them is ascertained. Now, that Jesus Christ is the supreme

Ruler of the nations, we know with infallible certainty, if we accept the Scriptures as the word of God.

But it may be asked—and this is the core of all the perplexity which attends the subject—Has the State any right to accept the Scriptures as the word of God? The answer requires a distinction, and that distinction seems to us to obviate all difficulty. If by accepting the Scriptures it is meant that the State has a right to prescribe them as a rule of faith and practice to its subjects, the answer must be in the negative. The State is lord of no man's conscience. As long as he preserves the peace, and is not injurious to the public welfare, no human power has a right to control his opinions or to restrain his acts. In these matters he is responsible to none but God. He may be atheist, deist, infidel, Turk, or pagan: it is no concern of the State, so long as he walks orderly. Its protecting shield must be over him, as over every other citizen. We utterly abhor the doctrine that the civil magistrate has any jurisdiction in the domain of religion, in its relations to the conscience or conduct of others, and we cordially approve the clause in our Confederate Constitution which guaranties the amplest liberty on this subject.

But if by accepting the Scriptures it is meant that the State may itself believe them to be true, and regulate its own conduct and legislation in conformity with their teachings, the answer must be in the affirmative. As a moral person, it has a conscience as really and truly as every individual citizen. To say that its conscience is only the aggregate of individual consciences, is to say that it is made up of conflicting and even contradictory elements. The State condemns many things which many of its subjects approve, and enjoins many things which many of its subjects condemn. There are those who are opposed to the rights of property and the institution of marriage, yet the public conscience sanctions and protects them both. Now what, then, is this public conscience? It is clearly the

sum of those convictions of right, that sense of the honorable, just, and true, which legislators feel themselves bound to obey in the structure of governments and the enactment of laws. It is a reflection of the law of God; and when that law is enunciated with authoritative clearness, as it is in the Scriptures, it becomes only the more solemnly imperative. And as the eternal rule of justice, the State should acknowledge it. Considered in its organic capacity as a person, it no more violates the rights of others in submitting itself to the revealed will of God, than a Christian, when he worships the supreme Jehovah, violates the rights of an atheist or idolater. What the State does itself, and what it enjoins upon others to do, are very different things. It has an organic life apart from the aggregate life of the individuals who compose it; and in that organic life, it is under the authority of Jesus Christ and the restraints of His holy word.

That in recognizing this doctrine the State runs no risk of trespassing upon the rights of conscience, is obvious from another point of view. The will of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, is not a positive constitution for the State: in that relation it stands only to the Church. It is rather a negative check upon its power. It does not prescribe the things to be done, but only forbids the things to be avoided. It only conditions and restrains the discretion of rulers within the bounds of the divine law. They are, in other words, a limitation, and not a definition of power. The formula according to which the Scriptures are accepted by the State is: Nothing shall be done which they forbid. The formula according to which they are accepted by the Church is: Nothing shall be done but what they enjoin. They are here the positive measure of power. Surely, the government of no Christian people can scruple to accept the negative limitations of the divine word. Surely, our rulers do not desire that they shall have the liberty of being wiser than God.

The amendment which we desire, we crave your honorable body to take note, does not confine the administration of the State exclusively to the hands of Christian men. A Jew might be our Chief Magistrate, provided he would come under the obligation to do nothing in the office inconsistent with the Christian religion. He is not required to say that he himself believes it, nor does he assume the slightest obligation to propagate or enforce it. All that he does is to acknowledge it as the religion of the State, and to bind himself that he will sanction no legislation that sets aside its authority. The religion of the State is one thing: the religion of the individuals who may happen to be at the head of affairs is quite another. The religion of the State is embodied in its constitution, as the concrete form of its organic life.

Your honorable body will perceive that the contemplated measure has no reference to a union or alliance betwixt the Church and the State. To any such scheme the Presbyterians, and, we think we can safely venture to say, the entire Christian people of these States, are utterly opposed. The State, as such, can not be a member, much less, therefore, can it exercise the function of settling the creed and the government of a church. The provinces of the two are entirely distinct: they differ in their origin, their nature, their ends, their prerogatives, their powers, and their sanctions. They can not be mixed or confounded without injury to both. But the separation of Church and State is a very different thing from the separation of religion and the State. Here is where our fathers erred. In their anxiety to guard against the evils of a religious establishment, and to preserve the provinces of Church and State separate and distinct, they virtually expelled Jehovah from the government of the country, and left the State an irresponsible corporation, or responsible only to the immediate corporators. They made it a moral person, and yet not accountable to the source of all law. It is this anomaly

which we desire to see removed; and the removal of it by no means implies a single element of what is involved in a national church.

The amendment which this General Assembly ventures respectfully to crave, we have reason to believe is earnestly desired, and would be hailed as an auspicious omen by the overwhelming majority of the Christian people of these Confederate States. Is it not due to them that their consciences, in the future legislation of the country, should be protected from all that has a tendency to wound or grieve them? They ask no encroachments upon the rights of others. They simply crave that a country which they love should be made yet dearer to them, and that the Government which they have helped to frame, they may confidently commend to their Saviour and their God, under the cheering promise that those who honor Him He will honor. Promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. God is the ruler among the nations; and the people who refuse Him their allegiance shall be broken with a rod of iron, or dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel. Our republic will perish like the pagan republics of Greece and Rome, or the godless republic of the United States, unless we baptize it into the name of Christ. Be wise now, therefore, oh ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth; kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little. We long to see, what the world has never yet beheld, a truly Christian republic, and we humbly hope that God has reserved it for the people of these Confederate States to realize the grand and glorious idea. God has wooed us by extraordinary goodness; He is now tempering us by gentle chastisements. Let the issue be, the penitent submission of this great people at the footstool of His Son.

The whole substance of what we desire, may be expressed in the following or equivalent terms, to be added to the section providing for liberty of conscience:

Nevertheless we, the people of these Confederate States, distinctly acknowledge our responsibility to God, and the supremacy of His Son, Jesus Christ, as King of kings and Lord of lords; and hereby ordain that no law shall be passed by the Congress of these Confederate States inconsistent with the will of God, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

ARTICLE V.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF COLUMBIA.

The third General Asssembly of our Church in the Confederate States of America was very justly said by its able and dignified Moderator, Dr. Lyon, as he was about to declare its dissolution, to have "despatched a large amount of business with exceeding harmony." The body began its work with thirty-nine ministers and twenty-one elders present, and it comprised a very good representation of the talents and character of our Church. Its eminent success in the despatch of well-done work, we suppose should be ascribed in part to the ability and zeal of its officers, but also largely to the fact that, until near the close of its sessions, it met but once a day. The committees thus had abundant opportunity to prepare their reports with care. Elaborated in private by the few, the many found it easy to agree upon their adoption.

Speaking of the adoption of the reports, we would take occasion to say how heartily we concur with those who criticise the ecclesiastical rule that all reports must first be

accepted before they can be adopted. We never could see the use of this preparatory step. Was there ever presented, or could there ever be presented in our Church courts, such a report as is not fit to be accepted? We have often seen the Assembly refuse to adopt, but never, to our knowledge, did it have occasion to reject a report as unsuitable to be received from one of its committees. We call this an ecclesiastical rule, because, so far as we know, it is not followed in other parliamentary bodies. Surely we do not need, amongst Presbyterian ministers and elders, any such special protection for the dignity of the body.

The narrow compass to which we are compelled to restrict our remarks on the Assembly, requires us to pass over entirely some of its proceedings that are of great interest. We shall comment on a few of its acts as briefly as possible. Under the former head we place the opening sermon of Dr. Kirkpatrick; the subject of the charter; the revision of the hymn book; the visits of the delegates from the Associate Reformed Church and the Independent Presbyterian Church; the pastoral letter on the religious instruction of the negroes; the transfer of the Columbia Theological Seminary; the overture of Mr. Coit, respecting Christian baptism; the overture of East Hanover Presbytery, respecting a union of Old and New School Presbyterians in the Confederate States; and the temporary consolidation of the four executive committees.

EDUCATION OF INDIGENT CANDIDATES.

The overture from Lexington Presbytery, proposing the reconstruction of the Assembly's scheme regarding the education of theological students, has not, so far as we know, been spread before the public eye, nor did we hear it read. The committee on bills and overtures reported favorably upon it; and the committee asked for by the Presbytery to review the whole subject, with the hope of discovering some better way of carrying forward this work,

was appointed. Their names are as follows: J. R. Wilson, J. N. Waddel, George Howe, and John Miller, ministers; J. T. L. Preston, ruling elder. From the reports and the debate on this subject, we gather that two points were prominent before the mind of the Assembly. One, the question of what has been called a class ministry; and the other, the question whether the General Assembly or the presbyteries can the better manage the dispensing of needful aid to indigent youth who feel called to preach the Gospel. Upon this latter point our own minds are perfectly settled. The Constitution gives to the presbytery the power of examining and licensing candidates for the ministry, and of ordaining, installing, removing, and judging ministers; and to them would, therefore, seem most naturally to belong the whole care of these young men. The General Assembly's powers regard those matters which are not local or individual, but concern directly the whole Church. The aim of our constitution manifestly is to give in charge to presbyteries only those affairs which sessions can not so well oversee, to synods only those which presbyteries can not so well oversee, and to the General Assembly only those which synods can not so well oversee. Now, it may be best for the Assembly to control theological education, considered in its general aspects, as in the direction of the seminaries; but the individual candidate, it seems clear, ought to hold all his relations to the presbyteries or sessions.

Upon the other question we shall not express such decided opinions. It is clear that our future supply of ministers depends upon the training of pious young men for the Gospel ministry. Where parents can afford the expense of this education, they ought to consider, and, so far as we have observed, they do in general consider it their privilege to be at this charge. But where a pious youth is indigent, who feels that he is called, and gives evidence that he is called to preach the Word, the Church ought to provide,

and may well provide for his wants, while he is preparing to serve her in the ministry. She is not bound to do this on principles of justice, for, of course, there can be no reward before there be service. But she is bound to do it on the principle of charity, and she may well do it on the principle of its being to her manifest advantage to educate this future minister. Yet there are, doubtless, some practical evils incidental to the Church's management of this work of charity. Some mercenary parents, who have the means of educating their sons, may, through covetousness, cast their offspring upon the bounty of others. Some unworthy young men may occasionally be the recipients of the Church's aid. Some poor youth, from a mere selfish wish to better his worldly condition, may once in a while grasp at the offer of a liberal education at the public expense. Some improper dispositions may be nurtured in the minds of some of our candidates, from the fact that they are taken up and supported by the Church before they are able to render her any return of service. Perhaps, in some cases, it would be better for the individual to have to earn his own bread while he is receiving his education, and to get into the ministry only through his own independent efforts. But our experience and observation lead us to the belief that all these are but exceptional cases. And we do not expect that the able committee appointed to review the whole subject will find it possible to make any essential changes for the better in the present arrangements. It is an ancient institute of God's Church to provide silver and changes of garments, and a place to dwell in that shall not be too strait, and also to set on the great pot and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets.

We can well imagine, however, that whatever incidental evils do occasionally manifest themselves, must be both more numerous and more aggravated where it is the highest court of the Church that undertakes to manage

such individual matters, than where they are left to the disposal of sessions or presbyteries.

SUPERANNUATED MINISTERS.

An overture from the Presbytery of Mississippi requested the Assembly to provide a fund for such ministers, to be placed in the hands of the committee of Domestic Missions. Prof. Lane, of Hopewell Presbytery, also overtured the Assembly for the same object, including with it the widows and families of deceased ministers, the funds to be in charge of the trustees of the Assembly.

This second overture evinces an earnest and most commendable zeal on the part of its author for the relief and comfort of God's aged and worn out servants and their destitute families. His plan of operation is well considered, and thoroughly matured in all its parts. The committee on bills and overtures seemed to think, however, that there are some preliminary questions which ought to be settled by the Assembly before it could enter upon any plan of operations in this matter. One of these was, whether an invested fund is preferable to annual collections; and another, whether the Assembly or the respective synods should undertake the work. They recommended the reference of the whole subject, in all its bearings, to a committee, who shall report to the next Assembly, and that said committee should consist of C. W. Lane and D. Wills, ministers, and E. A. Nisbet, Washington Poe, and W. L. Mitchell, ruling elders. Their recommendation was adopted.

There can be no doubt that this is a subject which demands consideration. It is attracting attention in more than one synod, and in different forms is forcing itself on the attention of the Church. And yet it is equally evident that no plan of action hitherto proposed meets with the hearty approbation of our ministers themselves, or of our people. There is a serious doubt whether it is a matter

that calls for any permanent endowment. This kind of provision is tolerated in some cases, but not cordially approved in any case, by many of the most earnest and sagacious amongst us. If the instances which call for the proposed relief are numerous enough to demand a provision from the whole Church, then the permanent fund desired might have to be a very enormous one to furnish the requisite amount of interest. A few thousand dollars a year would not suffice—we must invest by millions. Moreover, it is to be questioned whether this is a matter which the Lord expects us to provide for in this way. He did command the twelve to feed the five thousand in the desert place, but then He designed to manifest His own boundless riches and resources in the miraculous use of their five barley loaves and two small fishes, which otherwise had been totally inadequate. Is not this a case in which all we could gather would, without His miraculous blessing, be as those few loaves and small fishes; and in which the only adequate capital is that capital of Christian sympathy and love, ever living and ever active, by divine grace, in the bosom of God's people.

We must all have often noticed what a bungling thing legislative charity is apt to be. Whether it is Church or State which is, in its organized capacity, called to relieve human distress, it will very probably be inadequate relief, sometimes unjustly, sometimes unwisely, and sometimes unfeelingly administered. Of course we do not say that charity, which is a very complex term, is only for individuals or the deacons of the Church to administer. We do not say that there is no form of charity to which the judicatories of the Church in their organized capacity can be called. Even the General Assembly, as such, must undertake foreign missions, for example, which is just one of the highest forms of charity. But we say that we are not prepared to vote for a system of public charity to disabled ministers and to their destitute families, to be estab-

lished by our General Assembly. We are not prepared to vote for such a scheme to be undertaken by any of our Church courts, but most especially not by the General Assembly. It is no part of their powers or duties, as laid down by the constitution; nor are they, in the nature of things, a suitable body to undertake such individual concerns where no general law could be made to apply to all cases, and each individual case must be separately decided.

We consider the method of action proposed to be of doubtful influence upon the charity of the Church. Funded investments, many insist, are unfavorable to charity. But whether this be so or not, it does appear to us that a great Church fund, designed to sustain the large classes in question, and counting its revenues by hundreds of thousands of dollars, would be apt to work no advantage to the Church's poor but faithful servants. Is there no danger that some congregations might draw encouragement, from the very success of such an undertaking, to continue starving their minister all through his term of service, with the idea that when he shall get old, or if he shall leave a helpless family, here is an inexhaustible fund upon which he or they may be cast without any reproach falling thereby upon themselves?

But it will be said that it is not charity to support a superannuated minister, nor yet the destitute family of a deceased minister. We reply, it is so represented generally by its advocates; for they appeal to sympathy and to pity, and it is pictures of distress by which they would move the Church to action. But truly it is, indeed, no case of charity, and ought not to be made such by bringing it before the whole Church. It is the demand of justice which ought to be urged in favor of a minister, or the family of a minister, who has worn himself out in the service of the Church upon a very inadequate support. But who ought to pay the debt? Is it the whole Church, or the particular church or churches that have received the

unpaid labor? If you ask the needed relief from those who did not directly receive the service, it can only be upon the principle of charity.

We hold that the most potent remedy for the evil in question would be for the Church to act justly by her ministers, and give them an adequate support. The presbytery has this remedy largely in its hand. It is made its duty, by the constitution, to examine every call, and judge of the stipend promised. If the stipend be inadequate, it is a sin for the presbytery to take steps towards the installation, because they make themselves a party to the wrong that is doing. Let the Church first comply with justice, and adequately support her ministers, and then all the occasional cases for real charity that might still arise amongst their families, it would be very easy to have relieved upon the sacred principle of charity. If it be urged that many of our churches can not give an adequate support to their ministers, the answer is easy: Let the Presbytery's or the General Assembly's committee of Domestic Missions be applied to for help. It would be the very life of these committees to have such applications multiplied.

REVISION OF FORM OF GOVERNMENT AND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

In reference to this matter, we have only to state that the committee on nominations, inadvertently, of course, left out the name of Judge Shepherd, who had been made a member of the revision committee by the first Assembly. Correctly given, therefore, this committee is as follows: J. B. Adger, R. L. Dabney, B. M. Smith, E. T. Baird, T. E. Peck, and B. M. Palmer, ministers; W. P. Webb, T. C. Perrin, W. L. Mitchell, J. G. Shepherd, and W. P. Finley, ruling elders.

COMMISSIONERS TO THE ARMY.

One of the most important results of the Assembly's deliberations was their arrangements for the better supply

of the army with the word of life. Certainly, nothing that came before the body elicited more interest than this matter. And we trust that the Master is about to crown our plans and efforts with His peculiar blessing. The committee of missions are vigorously exerting themselves, with the aid of the commissioners, to procure as many chaplains and temporary missionaries as possible for the service of our noble soldiers, both in the east and in the west. The Lord also is graciously pouring out His Holy Spirit in peculiar measure upon various divisions of the army. Here, indeed, is a bright omen for the future. This Confederate people are not to be destroyed. Our young men are not to return home, when the war is over, corrupted in morals, to be a curse to their own communities. God is dealing with our soldiers and with our country in great love and mercy. Let us take encouragement to supply to the utmost of our ability their spiritual wants.

In the use of that individual freedom which this journal accords to every one of its contributors, without exception, we consider it proper, having undertaken this review of the Assembly, that, with great deference to the Assembly and their able committee who recommended the arrangements above referred to, we should say that we consider the language which they have used respecting the commissioners to the army somewhat open to criticism. In the first place, the expression adopted, "that we proceed to establish the office of commissioner," is unfortunate, for it might be understood to signify that the Assembly has actually set up a new office-bearer in the house of God, which we are sure no man in the Assembly designed doing. Again, it is to be regretted that the word "employ" was used, as it might be interpreted in the sense of the commissioners' having some authority over the ministers who go to the army; whereas we are confident that was not the design of the Assembly, as, indeed, the term which precedes, and also those which follow that word, show this was not the idea

of the committee who presented the report. They say the commissioner is to "welcome and employ other ministers on temporary visits to the army, and to give them opportunities of usefulness." This whole sentence, taken together, signifies, to our mind, very clearly, that the commissioner is simply to help the visiting brother to get at his work of preaching to the soldiers as quickly as possible, seeing that his visit is but temporary. Yet the term "employ," taken by itself, is capable of being, and actually has been, interpreted in the offensive way above indicated. Again, it would have been well, perhaps, to have made it still clearer than it is, under number two of the commissioner's powers, that he has no independent authority whatever with regard to placing chaplains in the army, but is merely designed to be the organ of communication between the individual minister and the colonel of the regiment.

We should hesitate much more to make these criticisms, but for the fact that the executive committee of Domestic Missions, as they are represented in their late circular, seem to have understood the Assembly in the sense which we personally consider so objectionable. They say that missionary laborers in the camps and in the hospitals "may obtain appointments to this work by making application to the executive committee or to the commissioners in the field, accompanying their applications in all cases by the recommendation of their presbyteries, or, where that is impracticable, by the recommendation of one or two well-known members of the presbytery. Individuals may be commissioned to labor for the summer months only, either as army missionaries or in hospital labors, if it is not possible for them to engage for a longer period."

This language is an official commentary by the executive committee upon the Assembly's action. According to this commentary, a minister that seeks to labor in a hospital or

camp is to receive his appointment either from the committee or from the commissioner, indifferently. Does not this imply that the full powers of the executive committee in the case belong to the commissioner? Nor is it given to him only in the case of a presbytery's recommending the minister, for he may appoint without any presbytery's voice at all. Nor is it only where a very brief term of labor is concerned, but also where the time of service is indefinite.

We understand that the appointments of the commissioner are always to be reported to the committee for confirmation, and that they issue to the minister his commission. But the appointment is, in the first instance, made by the commissioner alone. He exercises this power of his single will, and the committee must confirm, or else annul, an appointment already made for them. It is, in fact, a veritable appointment which this officer makes, and nothing is left to the committee but to issue the written evidence of it. The point of objection, of course, is not that bad appointments will be made, but that any appointments at all are authorized to be made by one man. The power of appointment is delegated by the Assembly to the executive committee, and they have no right to transfer the delegation to any other parties, and especially not to any single individual.

We are all familiar with the idea of commissions, which differ from a committee, in being empowered not only to inquire, but also to execute, subject to the revision of the court appointing them. They are, as Stewart of Purdivan expresses it, "a mere delegation of executive, not determining power." They are not the court itself, acting in the person of some of its members, for that would make it the same as the quorum, neither yet is it the court *ad interim*, as has sometimes been said, for then a regular, that is, technical, appeal would lie against the decision of a presbytery's or a synod's commission, the

same as against that of the court itself, which no one ever imagined. But the commission is just a committee with extraordinary powers; not simply inquiring, like ordinary committees, but acting in the name of the Church. The Waldenses have a commission which carries into effect the decisions of their Synod during the intervals of its meetings. The General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, since 1690, have generally named commissions before their own dissolution, to act in particular matters remitted to them, and to attend to the general interests of the Church, subject to review by the next Assembly. Our own early American Presbyterian Church was much in the habit of using commissions, though gradually they passed considerably into disuse. The old Boards, however, were all of them, and our own executive committees are all of them, just commissions, with powers limited severally to a specific object.

Now it is to be observed, in respect to these commissions, that they have always consisted of a number of ministers and elders—the quorum of the Scotch commission of Assembly being twenty-one. The same principle necessarily holds, though with less force, of course, in respect to the ordinary committee. They are the creatures of courts which are expressly ordained to exercise all their powers jointly. The very object of such courts is, that one man may not rule alone in God's house. It is the ordinance of Christ, by His apostles, that the Church be regulated through bodies of rulers, and not through single rulers. And so our Confession of Faith declares, that "the Church is to be governed by congregational, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies;" in other words, by the sessions, the presbyteries, (including the synods,) and the General Assembly. Such being the nature of all Church power of rule, it is seemly that the ordinary committee resemble in this particular the court that appoints it. The Church of God, from the beginning, has suffered untold misery and

evil from prelacy, and our Church may well be jealous of the same. It is seemly that she never should pass that power of will which, in its very nature and design, is joint power, into the hand of one man. We say it is Presbyterian doctrine and practice not to appoint committees of one. Stewart of Purdivan expressly says: "But the commission consisteth of both ministers and elders, without which no ecclesiastical judicatory or committee thereof can be lawful;" and he says, also, that a single minister acting by himself, as the delegate of a presbytery, "wants the stamp of ecclesiastical authority." (See Book I., Title XV., § 29.)

Accordingly, Presbyterians every where recognize two keys of the kingdom of heaven—the key of doctrine, and the key of discipline—the one in the hand of the teaching elder, and the other in the hands of a body of ruling elders. Accordingly, also, Presbyterians hold to two kinds, and but two kinds, of Church power; the power of teaching, which is several, and the power of ruling, which is joint. Under Presbyterian church government, one man teaches; but, under that government, one man never rules. It is prelacy whenever one man undertakes to do, or is allowed or appointed to do, any act of ruling the Church by himself.

Now, what kind of power is that which, according to the committee, is to be exercised by the commissioner to the army? Part of his work is to preach, which is perfectly legitimate—it is several power, and pertains to him as a minister of the Word. But partly his duty and his power is to rule these, and to do it singly. He is, according to his sole discretion, to locate one brother in this camp, and another in that hospital. What is this but governing and ruling in the Church by one man? He has the appointing power of a whole commission in his single hand. He is to be the superior of his brethren, and this is not presbyterian, but prelatic. It is impossible that our Assembly should deliberately and designedly give any such power as this to

one man. They did not do it. The committee misinterpret the Assembly. One circumstance proves this unanswerably—they said not one word to the commissioner about his making any report to them. Their committees and commissions all report, because it is ruling power that is committed to them; and the court must revise what they do, because the power lies in the court. But all they designed this commissioner to do was to go and preach himself, and assist other preachers to find fields of labor, either for short or long periods; and accordingly they said nothing about any report, for none was expected.

There is but one plea on which the committee can defend their interpretation of the office, and that is, that the army is a field for the labors of the evangelist, properly so called. But we deny that this is the fact. The army is in our own country, and, as it were, in the very bosom of the Church. The commissioner will find other ministerial brethren all over the army, and churches all around him, wherever he goes. There was no call, therefore, for the evangelist proper, who goes forth beyond the limits of the settled church-state; and, being an extraordinary officer, established of the Lord on purpose to found churches where they are not, of course carries with him, and in his single hand, the full powers of the presbytery. And that in the view of the Assembly there was no call for the evangelists in the army, appears in their refusal to substitute, on Dr. Wilson's motion, the name evangelist for the one chosen.

The "superintendent," and the "visitor or commissioner," of the Scotch Kirk, at its first setting up, from 1560 to 1580, it may be said, perhaps, is very much the same as the commissioner appointed now by our Assembly. It would be an unlucky comparison for any one to make. That office of superintendent, or commissioner, has been the cause of many reproachful charges of a modified prelacy against the First Book of Discipline. No one would now go beyond the Second Book of Discipline for prece-

dents, back to the incompletely developed Presbyterianism of the period of the First Book, which Stewart of Purdivan calls the "Infantile state of this Reformed Church." Although Hetherington so indignantly affirms that "the superintendents had no one thing in common with prelates," we can not but hold, from the description of the office in the First Book, that it did confer a partial episcopacy upon all who filled it. But we have no zeal to prove that this long-extinct office savored of prelacy; there has been, it must be confessed, and it is declared by Hetherington himself, a great plenty of that abomination at many periods of Scotch Church history. We are quite willing to let McCrie's testimony go unchallenged when he says: "In the examination of those whom they admitted to the ministry, they were bound to associate with them the ministers of the neighboring parishes. They could not exercise any spiritual jurisdiction without the consent of the provincial synods, over which they had no negative voice." But here is an office, alleged to be established by the Assembly, in which one brother is empowered to employ other equal brethren under him, and without any voice of an ecclesiastical judicatory or any commission of ministers and elders thereof directing or controlling his doings; is to determine, at his sole discretion, the places where his equal brethren may or may not labor, and so is to rule both them and the Church through them, singly and alone, which is to make him a diocesan bishop. We should, indeed, be sorry to believe that our General Assembly, after demolishing so completely the whole system of Boards, chiefly on the ground that they were a dangerous infringement of the powers of a free Church, should have deliberately or designedly violated, in this fashion, our constitution, and departed from the fundamental principles of our divine polity.*

* Both in 1644 and 1697 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland were under the same necessity laid recently on ours, to arrange for send-

TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

On this subject Col. Preston presented resolutions which were adopted unanimously. They expressed the conviction that God is now asserting amongst us His supremacy as "Governor of the nations," and that no nation can prosper that sets aside "the statutes of Jehovah." And upon the ground that some of our statesmen, impressed with these views, are seriously meditating the repeal of the Sabbath mail laws, they testified against the national sin of Sabbath violations, imploring Congress to put away from our young nation this cause of divine anger. They referred strongly to the Sabbath, as being "the solemn court-day of our sovereign King," whose blessing, "as Lord of the Sabbath, the nation's voice was pleading for." In connexion with these resolutions, Col. Preston read a letter from the late lamented Gen. Jackson, the last lines, probably, which that Christian hero ever wrote, in which he refers to Messrs. Chilton and Curry, members of Congress from Alabama, as favoring the repeal of the Sabbath mail laws, and mentions that Mr. Curry, a stranger to himself previously, had just written him a letter on the subject, in which he had expressed the conviction that divine laws could be violated with impunity neither by governments nor individuals. Gen. Jackson expressed the opinion that the present was an "auspicious moment for such action, as the people are looking to God for assistance."

NATIONAL RECOGNITION OF CHRIST'S SUPREMACY.

The passage of Col. Preston's resolutions was used by Col. Walker as a suitable opportunity to ask leave for the

---

ing a constant supply of ministers from time to time to the army, relieving each set at proper times by fresh appointees. They had also to furnish regular chaplains to be settled in the regiments. This latter work they arranged to have done either by the presbyteries or their own commission. The former business was put into the hands of their commission.

reading of a document presented by Dr. Thornwell to the Assembly at Augusta, upon which he offered three resolutions, adopting the memorial as the deliverance of this Assembly, requesting other Churches to unite with us in its great object, and appointing a committee to present it to the Confederate Congress. Subsequently he amended the third resolution, so as to provide that the committee should publish the memorial, and correspond with other ecclesiastical bodies relative to it, and to act with them in bringing it before Congress.

Prof. Peck moved to make this subject the special order of the day, for to-morrow, at eleven o'clock. No man was dearer to him than the author of the memorial, but he should be compelled to vote against its adoption.

Prof. Lane moved to refer to a committee, to report upon it to the next Assembly.

Dr. Kirkpatrick opposed this motion, for we had never been in a more favorable condition for such action as was proposed in the memorial. The mind of our whole people was become Christian. The secular papers were speaking of Jackson as the exponent of the South's confidence in God. We have at last a President who will acknowledge our position in relation to God. At the last Assembly a memorial in regard to the proper observance of the Sabbath in the army was adopted, though many thought it would do no good. It had been sent to the President, and not a month elapsed before orders were issued enjoining the very things we had desired, and often in the express words of the memorial. The evangelical churches represent seven-eighths of the people of this land, and if they will unite together the change can be effected.

The motion prevailed, and when the subject came up the next day, Mr. Atkinson said it had always seemed to him one of the strangest things that a nation as truly Christian as any upon the face of the earth, should not be professedly Christian. Nor is it enough that we should recognize the

God of paganism, but we must recognize the God of the Bible. No man is a Christian who does not believe in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as revealed in the Scriptures. Of course, however, no union between Church and State is admissible. The people of Virginia, who have suffered from such a union, for this reason feel an extreme aversion to any thing looking that way. But in avoiding one error, we should beware of its opposite. He was astonished at the extreme timidity of this body, the representative of a Church which has been accustomed to unfurl the standard of truth in the face of every foe.

Mr. Miller said he thought it "wise not to oppose this measure as certainly mistaken, but only as *doubtful*, because, though our instincts are now strongly against it, yet it is fresh and novel, and further reflection might lead to a change of mind; and because, also, this more moderate course will take with us more of the Assembly.

"The measure is doubtful, first, in its principle; secondly, in the paper it proposes to make use of, viz., this memorial; and thirdly, as a measure to be passed by this particular Assembly.

"I. The act itself of inscribing a sentence recognizing the Christian religion upon the Constitution of the Confederate States, is doubtful in its principle, because:

"1st. It is not clear in its *pertinency*. The Constitution is a directory for building and working a government. Government is a police, a mere sword-bearer. It is not to dig canals, or enrich manufacturers, or erect churches. At least, if it is, the mass doubt it. The Constitution of South Carolina, where the influence of the honored framer of this memorial has been felt for years, has no recognition of Christianity. Whatever of this sort may fairly regulate the working of constitutions, may properly be taken for granted. Constitutions generally do not set out with the obligations of truth or respect for the people, or the sacredness of international rights. Our Book of Discipline

has no formal recognition of Christianity that I remember, nor has the Constitution for Columbia Seminary, that we adopted yesterday. There is no necessary disrespect, therefore, in leaving it out.

"2d. It is not clear in its *significance.* Does it mean that the majority of our people are Christians? That is a historical fact, not a constitutional principle. It may be true to-day and false to-morrow. Does it mean the government must enforce Christianity? The very memorial that is proposed denies that. Does it mean that the government must not disturb religion? The Constitution provides for that already. And when gentlemen say that the act we have just passed about Sunday mails involves all that this memorial would, they forget that running Sunday mails violates conscience, and we are already protected against that by the Constitution of the Confederate States.

"3d. The act proposed is not clear in its *usefulness.* It is too easy a thing to be of much value as a service to God. The vilest Christian nations that ever lived have done the most of it. The Jews, at the period of their worst corruption, made broad their phylacteries, and wrote texts of Scripture upon their foreheads and upon the posts of their doors. And at this point a great ethical fact comes in, true of all Christendom, that communities are not ruined by a bad government so much as by a bad Church. It was so in Boston. It was so in Paris. It was so in early times on the eastern borders of our Southern States. A corrupt parish system led to the infidelity of Jefferson, and men of that school. Governments do not go to pieces, or even abandon Christianity, at their own instance, but upon the decay of the Church: and therefore the importance of invigorating Christianity, and carrying it to our armies and our frontiers, rather than of inscribing it upon the Constitution of the Government.

"II. This paper is doubtful. It is too long, and too much in detail, too rich in the profusion of genius, to express the

opinion of any large body of men. A plainer mind would have produced one that we could all more nearly have united in. There are minor sentences to differ about. It says, 'All just government is the ordinance of God.' I believe that all government is the ordinance of God; and that that government in respect to which Paul taught this doctrine was the government of Nero, the vilest in any land. It says, 'Government is a moral person;' and then, on the basis of this highly figurative expression, builds an argument. All moral persons have conscience. Government, therefore, must have a conscience. Conscience must have a law. And that law, in the case of governments, may as well be the Christian religion. Is that a good metaphysical argument, one that we will trust ourselves to in what ought to be like the papers of Louis Napoleon, a terse and clear utterance?

"And then, in respect to this divine law for government, does that interfere, as this paper declares, (practically, and as respects their liberty, *quoad* the government, to judge for themselves,) with the supremacy of the people?

"The paper declares the 'godless republic of the North,' to be a fresh instance of how nations perish that neglect to recognize Christianity. But does the framer forget that we were of that republic but a few months ago? Is South Carolina under the same condemnation as the North, and far on towards ruin, because, as a sovereign republic, she has no such recognition?

"The great beauty of this paper, as its advocates point it out, viz., that it unties an ancient difficulty, by showing that a State may have a religion, though it may not have a church, is, we are bold to say, the unsoundest part of its reasonings. In these respects our religion *is* a church. It is a very narrow church. In all the creed-imposing features of a church, it is one of the most aggressive character. All that most intellectual and influential body of men who deny the divinity of Christ, and all those who serve the

pope, and who exclude the Bible, it directly excommunicates. It would be more oppressive than some establishments of Church and State, because they occurred, as in catholic Britain, for example, among a unanimous people; but we, in our day, would have to impose our creed, as trinitarian and protestant, upon many forms of dissent. Is it fair? If the majority grew prelatic, and believed the apostolic succession to be as necessary to salvation as the divinity of Christ, would it be fair to put that into the Constitution? Does the proposed appeal to Congress comport with what is already in the Constitution, or with the preamble of our form of Government, which labors so with the idea of perfect liberty of conscience."

The remainder of Mr. Miller's speech we necessarily exclude, and the more readily, as it related to the minor question, whether this Assembly was prepared to adopt.

Prof. Peck said, "It appears to me—

"1. That there is an impropriety in the Assembly's making use of the paper before them, a paper which had been presented to a preceding Assembly by its lamented author, and by him withdrawn; that, for all we know, his views might have undergone some change, and he might not now approve, if he were living, the use we are making of it. But even if this were not so, it is unbecoming in a body like this to present to the Confederate Congress a paper which is not the offspring of its own mind, and therefore not capable of being fully expounded and defended.

"2. That, in considering this question upon its merits, we should lay aside all prejudice arising from the association of certain views with the name of Jefferson, notoriously an infidel; for the principles embodied in his famous bill for establishing religious liberty were earnestly contended for, years before, by the Presbytery of Hanover, and urged by petition, memorial, and remonstrance, upon the legislature of Virginia.

"3. That the principles of this paper were, for the most part, eminently sound, and stated with the luminousness for which the lamented author was so remarkable; especially, that the statements in regard to the precise relations of the word of God to the State and Church, respectively, were all that he could desire; that for the Church, the word of God was a positive law, and the Church's power strictly 'ministerial and declarative,' both in the sphere of faith and of manners; while for the State, the Scripture only operated in a negative way, as a check upon reason and the light of nature, which were the positive rule by which the civil magistrate was to be guided; that to propose, therefore, as this memorial proposes, to insert a clause in the civil constitution by which the supremacy of the Son of God should be acknowledged, made the memorial contradict itself, since it asked the civil power to accept the Bible as a positive guide, and, *pro tanto*, to usurp the functions of the Church. All that the paper could ask, consistently with its own statements concerning the relation of the Bible to the State, was that Congress would do nothing inconsistent with the revealed fact of the supremacy of Christ. This is what the Assembly has just done, in its overture touching the observance of the Sabbath.

"4. Further, that the argument used on this floor for this addition to the Constitution, to wit, that we do not recognize the true God unless we recognize the Son, if it proves any thing, proves that we should recognize the Holy Ghost also.

"5. That one effect of such a change would be to exclude all honest unbelievers from our civil councils. No man can say 'Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' (1 Cor. 12 : 1.) This would land us in the doctrine of the fifth monarchy fanatics. If it should be said that upon the same ground all acknowledgment of God would be excluded from the Constitution, since no man can truly acknowledge God without the Holy Ghost, he would

answer that there is a revelation of God through the very condition of man's moral nature, and that this recognition is sufficient for the purposes of civil government; and we are bound to make this recognition, because the civil government is an ordinance of God, the Creator and moral Governor for the whole human race. But to make a distinctive doctrine of revelation a part of our fundamental law, would operate like all other religious tests—it would fill the land with hypocrites.

"6. Lastly, to do what this memorial proposes, is to make the civil magistrate a judge in matters of faith, and thereby to bring us back to the ages of superstition and cruelty, when the burning of the bodies of saints was an 'act of faith.' Give the magistrate this power, and no man can tell how it will be exercised. Insert one article of a Confession of Faith in the fundamental law, and you may have, in the course of time, a Confession as large as that of the Westminster Assembly, and by no means as sound."

This last head of remark, Prof. Peck has said to us was in his mind when he spoke, but he did not bring it out precisely as here written down.

We have been at pains to procure from their respective authors these brief notes of their speeches in opposition to the paper, from a wish to gratify and instruct the Church, and also because we love free discussion. The paper of Dr. Thornwell, subsequently withdrawn by those who introduced it, is recorded elsewhere in this number of our journal; and we propose now to submit to our readers a few observations on this important subject.

We do not design to maintain that the Assembly ought to have adopted this paper; for, however successfully it might have been vindicated from all the objections brought against it, (including those two mutually opposite ones, that it had too much and that it had too little logic in it,) still we confess to a sympathy with the idea of Dr. Lyon, that it does not become the Assembly to petition Congress

upon any subject.* It is every way more suitable for the Church to utter simply its testimony, and then let the citizen or citizens present all needful memorials. Moreover, it is now too late to appeal to Congress for any changes of the Constitution. No change in that instrument can be effected, except the concurrent voice of three States first demand a convention of all the States for the purpose of amending it. What might have been accomplished with comparative ease when first proposed by Dr. Thornwell, will now be found well-nigh impossible. Yet truth is mighty, and her triumphs are all the greater in proportion to their difficulty.

In the first place, we insist that the State has a life and being and responsibility of its own. To a certain extent it is a moral person. The proof is ample.

1. The nations, in proportion as they are or have been free, do claim, or have claimed this attribute as belonging to them. Their constitutions, whether written or unwritten, assert it for them. The sovereignty they challange is an attribute of life, and belongs only to a person. Hence the fierceness of every free nation's defence of its liberties. The life of not even an individual will be surrendered by him tamely, and the life of a State can not be forcibly taken away, if ever, except after a terrible struggle. Even Poland ever and anon still shows signs of life. Our own States of this Confederacy refused to give up the life that is in them, and become merged into one great consolidation, and hence the tremendous contest that is now waging. It speaks in tones of thunder that these States have, in a certain clear and distinct sense, a personal being which they never will surrender.

2. The nations not only make this claim for themselves, but generally acknowledge it when made by others. This is the outrage which we maintain that England and France

* Religion and Politics—S. P. R., Vol. XV., page 596.

have committed against these Confederate States. In 1776, the States of the late Union declared themselves free, sovereign, and independent States, and set up a confederacy in which this attribute of each State was carefully reserved. In 1778, France entered into a treaty with them, acknowledging these attributes. In 1783, Great Britain did the same. Nothing has since occurred to destroy their freedom, sovereignty, or independence. But France and England now decline to acknowledge these attributes in us, but still ascribe them to the States that make war upon us. This is the outrage committed by them. The keen sense of it felt in all our bosoms, is the proof that we know these States to have a life and being of their own, entitling them to separate and independent standing and action.

3. The actions that nations perform show that they are moral persons. It is the State that makes the constitution and the laws, that coins money, that prohibits or commands, that punishes or defends, that makes war or peace. It is the people as such, the people in their collective capacity, through representatives, that do these things, and not the separate individuals of the people. These are the actions of the nation, and in these acts no distinction of individual can be made. And these acts of the nation have a moral character, by which they can be judged, just as the acts of individuals have. And the wisdom and justice, or the sin and folly of these acts affect good and bad amongst the people, those who agree to them and those who object to them, in many cases equally and alike. It is the nation that is acting, and the individual is swallowed up in the whole body.

4. Accordingly, there is such a thing as national character, different in different nations. The terms English, French, Spanish, suggest different qualities. There was such a thing as American character. There is such a thing

as Yankee character, and such a thing as the character of our own Confederate people.

5. God regards the nations, whether they are free or subject to a monarch, as having a life and responsibility of their own. The powers that be are His creatures, moral persons that He hath ordained. It would be perfectly vain for any one to try and eliminate from the Bible this idea of national responsibility as separate from that of individuals. It runs through the whole texture of the book. It sets before us a King of kings and a Lord of lords, who makes them and all other civil magistrates His ministers of justice for the time being. It addresses the kingdoms continually as persons, and it threatens and it promises them as such. It also records the punishments and rewards which, as such, they received. God is the Lord of the nation as well as of the family and of the Church. One might as well deny the life and being of the Church as of the State. It can no more be questioned that the Almighty is the judge of the nation than of the individual. Nor can it be denied that His judgments upon the nations, as such, are usually visited upon them during that mortal career which exhibits them in their organic unity.

It may be objected to this argument, that it can be carried out in such a way as to prove every kind of corporation to be a moral person, and to have a life and responsibility peculiar to them. If any one choose so to do, we make him heartily welcome, and bid him good success in the endeavor. We have no fear that corporations of any sort will ever become unduly alive to their moral responsibility.

In the second place, we maintain that, the State being under moral obligations, should acknowledge the fact to herself and to all men. If God be her King indeed, it is impossible that she should not be bound publicly and officially to recognize Him in that character. Mr. Miller maintained that it was not *pertinent* for the State to acknowledge her King in her constitution. If there be any more

suitable place or form for the acknowledgment, let him grant that she ought to make it there and so. But it is withholding from the Almighty what is due to Him, when the State, which is His creature, does not somehow officially acknowledge Him and pay Him homage. We complain that England and France are unjust to us, because they refuse to recognize us as sovereign. This is just what we do to God; and the impulse of every believer's heart is, to inquire whether there may not be some connexion between the two refusals of recognition.

Amongst all the exercises of moral responsibility, the highest is to pay homage to God; and we insist, therefore, that, whatever else the State, as a moral person, may neglect to do, she must not fail to recognize her God.

But it is objected that this will unite Church and State. By no means. Let us not, in our well-founded and just zeal against any such union, more hurtful always to the former than it can be to the latter, run to the other extreme, and deny to the State her moral character and responsibility to God. The three societies which God has ordained, the Family, the Church, the State, are each supreme in its own sphere, and quite independent of one another; but they are coördinate, and God is their common head, and each is bound to worship and pay Him homage.

Mr. Miller considers it a fallacy to say that the State may have a religion without establishing a church. And his answer to it is that our religion is a church, and a very narrow and aggressive church at that. Very true. Does the paper propose that the Constitution recognize *our* religion? The fallacy is with himself, and it lies in his not distinguishing between what must be the religion of the individual citizen, as embodied for him in his particular church, or form of Christianity, and that solemn official recognition of the King of kings which is due to Him from the people in their collective capacity.

It is objected, again, that it would not be fair to Jews, Unitarians, and others, to have the State acknowledge Christ. We answer, it is a question of conscience, for the Christian people of this country, whether their Government, in the guilt and punishment of whose sins they must bear their share, shall refuse due homage to Him who ordained it as His creature. It is impossible to make it other than a question of conscience for Christian people, because, acknowledging the State to be endowed by the Creator with moral responsibility, they can not deny its duty to recognize Him who gave it being. It is conscience, then, against conscience, and the majority must rule.

The hinge on which the whole question turns is, we conceive, the moral personality of States. If they do possess that attribute, they may not innocently refuse to recognize the King of kings. On the other hand, if they are not bound to recognize Him, it must be because they have no life and being and responsibility of their own, apart from the individuals who compose them. One of these two positions must be true, and the other false, for they are opposites. Nor can the two views be combined together. If the State is not a moral person, and has no conscience, and no God, but deals only between man and man, in the relations of this life, as a mere police, then, of course, it is right for her not to acknowledge Christianity at all. But then, she must not bow to the power of Christianity in the least, nor aim to confine her laws to such as comport with Christianity. Then it was wrong to have the very name of God introduced at all into our Confederate Constitution, for there may be some atheists amongst us; and whether there be or not, the State has no relations at all to God, and it is not pertinent to refer to Him in any way whatsoever. Then, too, no oath must be exacted in any court of justice, or of any man elected to public office, for why regulate by law such appeals to God, when the State, whose business it is to make laws, can not know any thing about God? Then,

also, there must be no punishment of blasphemy, or adultery, or polygamy; for without the Scriptures it had not been known that these are criminal; and then, moreover, capital punishment could not stand upon its true basis, as a positive enactment of Him who created man's life, and accordingly it must be abolished in deference to the numerous objections brought against it from anti-Christian quarters. Thus we must have either a godless or a Christian republic.

Upon this principle of the State's responsibility to God were based the resolutions of Col. Preston, respecting Sabbath mails, which the Assembly unanimously adopted. Jehovah, the supreme Governor, asserting now His supremacy over the nation; the Sabbath, the solemn court-day of our sovereign King; Sabbath violation, a sin of the nation; the nation's voice pleading with Congress for the blessing of the Lord of the Sabbath; these are the expressions employed in those resolutions. The immortal Jackson quotes members of Congress, expressing the conviction that neither nations nor individuals can sin against God with impunity, and that hero says: "Now is the time to persuade the State to acknowledge in this way her fealty to God, for now she is feeling her need of His help." All this was unsuitable, if the State has no life of her own, and is not a moral person. It is true, there is another form of objection to Sunday mails, viz., that the Christian postmaster's conscience is thereby violated. That is bad enough, but it affects only the few who are postmasters. The great objection to Sunday mail laws is, that by them our country and our Government are made to violate God's law. Our representatives, by those laws, bring sin upon us, and put the Bible against our young Government. Now, if this be a violation of the conscience of every considerate Christian amongst us, so it ought to be that his country is made to refuse the recognition of the King of kings. The same Scriptures which command the Sabbath

to be kept holy, also command that all nations, as well as individuals, should acknowledge the authority of Jesus.

The weightiest objection to the paper, it will probably appear to most persons, is that one which Prof. Peck made under his third head of remarks. The thinking of that gentleman, it is well known, is clear and vigorous and profound. With great respect, we suggest to him whether, after all, the inconsistency with itself which he finds in the memorial does not depend upon a misconception of his own. Had he whom we both loved so well but survived to this day, no one knows better than Prof. Peck with what masterly power he could, perhaps, have replied to this and to every other objection brought against the memorial; for he never investigated any great question slightly, and never publicly committed himself to views that he had not fully matured. For ourselves, we are persuaded that it was only the occasion which he lacked at Augusta to have commended the sublime doctrine of his paper to the judgment of all his brethren, and the heart of the whole Church.

Let us see, now, in what Prof. Peck agrees with the memorial, and in what he differs from it. Its statements in regard to the precise relations of the word of God to the State and Church, respectively, were all that he could desire—for the Church it is a positive, and for the State a negative law. But to propose what the memorial proposes is inconsistent with itself, for it asks the State to accept the Bible as a positive guide; which would be to put itself into the position of the Church, and a usurpation of her functions. All that the paper can properly ask of the State is, to do nothing inconsistent with the revealed fact of Christ's supremacy. Thus Prof. Peck finds the logic of the paper at fault, and points out a fatal defect in its course of argument. But let us revert to the statements of Dr. Thornwell, which Prof. Peck says that he cordially approves: "The formula according to which the State accepts the Scriptures is, that nothing shall be done which they forbid;

that according to which the Church accepts them is, nothing shall be done but what they enjoin." The point here is, that the State can not infringe upon the conscience of any man, so long as it does not put itself into the Church's position, and undertake to carry out all the positive injunctions of the Word. Every man's rights of conscience are safe, so long as the State leaves him to believe what he may, and to worship God as he thinks right, only refraining herself from doing any thing which the Word forbids. But is it not plain that, if the State accept the Scriptures at all, even in this negative way, (as both Prof. Peck and Dr. Thornwell agree that she ought to do,) she does *ipso facto* make an acknowledgment of Christianity as her religion. Prof. Peck says: The State may have a religion, nay, must have a religion, and that religion Christianity, but its office must be simply to check the ruler whenever reason and the light of nature are a positive guide. This is all that Dr. Thornwell maintains. But does not this imply that the ruler first recognizes and acknowledges the authority of the Author of Christianity? Prof. Peck agrees with the memorial, that the Government may *actually* accept the Scriptures, but he says that for it to do so *in words* would be monstrous. Rulers, he says, have no right to do any thing forbidden in the Bible, *for the reason* that it is Christ's word, who is King of kings; but for them to put into words the ground of their conduct, and confess that Christ is their King, would be impious usurpation of the Church's functions. He would not object to asking Congress not to do any thing inconsistent with the revealed fact of Christ's supremacy, but he shrinks from the idea of the Christian people of this Confederacy saying, in their organic law: "Nevertheless we, the people of these Confederate States, distinctly acknowledge our responsibility to God, and the supremacy of His Son, Jesus Christ, as King of kings and Lord of lords, and hereby ordain that no law shall be passed by the

Congress of these Confederate States inconsistent with the will of God as recorded in the Holy Scriptures."

There is, we must insist, therefore, no ground for impugning the logic of the memorial. It does not contradict itself. To declare that the Word is a negative rule for States, is not inconsistent with insisting that they should acknowledge it as such a rule. Nor would the State which acknowledges Christianity as her religion, and the Author of Christianity as her King, thereby put herself into the Church's position, and undertake to do all the things which the Word enjoins. Before Christianity can become either a negative rule for the State or a positive rule for the Church, it must be acknowledged by each in that relation. This is all the memorial desires from our rulers on behalf of our country. We only seek to have our newborn Government, the creature of His peculiar providential power and goodness, acknowledge officially that it is His minister, to do nothing which His word forbids. And we desire that the Government may do this for itself, and not for the individual citizen; discharging simply its own duty in the premises, as a moral person, responsible to God, and not undertaking at all to guide any man in the discharge of his own individual duty to Jehovah.

We conclude by reiterating the grand and solemn statements of the memorial. "God's revealed will is the true supreme, and should be so acknowledged. If that be not recognized by the State, it can acknowledge no sense of moral obligation and no feeling of the eternal principles of right, for these are nothing except as they stand related to the will of the one living and true God. If the acknowledgment of His will as supreme law be not the very foundation-stone of a constitution, it is bereft of all vital power or binding force. If there be no God distinctly acknowledged by the people, they will then be a God to themselves. The will of the majority must then become

the supreme law, and any constitution prove itself a dead letter. God is now showing what this denial of His claims by a people highly favored and blessed can work amongst them. Oh! may it be given to the remnant of these States, whom He is saving from the terrible gulf, to know their God, and to acknowledge their King.

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVI.—NO. 2.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXIII.

ARTICLE I.

CHURCH AND STATE.

The fundamental relations implied in the distinction between "the things which are God's, and the things which are Cæsar's," have been recognised, more or less clearly, from the beginning of the history of our race. These relations are that of man to man in a state of society, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, that of man to God. They have been designated by different names, and have been the objects of divers kinds of legislation, according to the diversities of age and country; but, whether known by this name or that; whether, in practice, partially separated or totally confounded, the relations themselves have been, and could not but be, apprehended. The relation of man to man would force itself upon the notice by the necessities of every day's existence; the relation of man to God would be developed in the operations of conscience, arraigning the offender before an invisible tribunal, and pointing him to a coming retribution. Yet it cannot be denied that in reference to few objects of human thought

have attempts at articulate exposition been more unsuccessful than in reference to this; or, that the wisdom of the wisest man has still more signally failed, by any kind of political machinery, to realize perfectly the theories which make the most plausible approximations to the truth.

It is only in modern times, indeed, that the philosopher has undertaken to grapple with these relations, with a view to the practical separation of the spheres of the temporal and the spiritual, the civil and the ecclesiastical, the Church and the State. In the ancient forms of civilization, in its leading types, the Oriental, the Greek, and the Roman, we look in vain for any discrimination between these powers. In the East, the cradle of the human race, and the seat of vast empires, where the patriarchal idea and the patriarchal sentiment pervade and mould the whole fabric of society, the monarch is not merely the highest religious functionary, but a divinity, the object of worship to his subjects. In Greece, the cradle of philosophy, and the scene of the proudest triumphs of speculative thought, we find a similar, though not so complete an identification of the civil and the religious. The miraculous subtlety of Aristotle was as unequal to this discrimination, as it was to the discovery of the fact and the necessity of a physical creation *ex nihilo.* Among the Romans, whose extraordinary genius for government made them the masters of the world, we find a still larger infusion of orientalism than among the Greeks, and far less of a speculative tendency; and consequently, a more complete confusion of the relations which belong to man as a sojourner on earth, with the relations which belong to him as the subject of a supreme invisible power. In illustration of this point, we take the liberty of quoting a paragraph or two from an Essay on Roman Legislation, by that able lawyer and accomplished scholar, Hugh S. Legaré, of South Carolina. We offer no apology for the length of the quotation, as it is the legislation of Rome, more than all other causes combined, which has determined

the posture of all Christendom for ages upon this great question:

"The legislation and history of Rome are altogether unintelligible without a distinct apprehension of the causes, the extent, and the consequences of this extraordinary influence—[the influence of the class of the hereditary priests and jurists of the Republic, the ulema behind the throne greater than the throne itself.] All nations are governed more by manners and opinions than by laws, and the Romans above all other nations. But their manners and opinions were formed and directed by this *caste* of lawyer-priests, an institution quite oriental, transmitted to them through Tuscany, at once by inheritance and by education. In every part of their annals, from the earliest struggles of the *plebs*, in the freshness and vigor of youthful health and enthusiasm, under their immortal tribunes, down to periods of degeneracy and servitude, the same spirit is everywhere visible. Religion, law, subordination, or all these names in one, *discipline*, civil and military, at home and abroad—'this was their sorcery.' Created to teach the law to all coming time, they regarded it with instinctive awe, approached its oracles as those of their Gods, and yielded to it a devoted, yet magnanimous and enlightened obedience. Hence it was that revolution after revolution occurred; that the assemblies of the Curiæ were superseded by those of the Centuries, and these in turn overshadowed by those of the tribes; that the veto of a single tribune, clothed himself in no armor but that of religion, (inviolable, *sacrosanctus*,) could bring on universal anarchy by preventing all elections, and leaving every office vacant; that repeated secessions of the *plebs* to the mountain appropriately called *sacred*, or to the Janiculum, took place; that for centuries together the story of Roman politics, omitting the wars altogether, is, in the hands of Livy, and even of Dionysius, by far the most thrilling and sublime of historical romances; and yet that, in the midst of so many elements of disorder and violence, not one drop of blood was shed in civil war, and the glorious commonwealth,

> 'Rising in clouded majesty, at length,
> Apparent queen, unveiled her peerless light.'"

Again, speaking of the *libri rituales*, (to the Romans what the Mosaic ritual was to the Hebrews,) Mr. Legaré says,

after Festus: "They teach the rites with which cities are to be founded, and altars and temples dedicated; the holiness of the walls of towns; the law relating to their gates; how tribes, wards, and centuries are to be distributed; armies organized and arrayed; and other, the like, things relating to peace and war." Then adds: "We see the same influence extending itself over the very soil of the Roman territory, and making, in the technical language of their augury, one vast temple of it. It was consecrated by the auspices; it could become the property only of one who had the auspices, that is, a patrician or *Roman*, properly so called; once set apart and conveyed away, it was irrevocably alienated, so that sales of the domain were guaranteed by religion, and it was sacrilegious to establish a second colony on the place dedicated to a first. Auspices could be taken no where else but on some spot which *they* had rendered sacred. The city, by its original inauguration, was also a temple; its gates and walls were holy; its *pomœrium* was unchangeable, until higher auspices had suspended those under which it was first marked out. Every spot of ground might become, by the different uses to which it was applied, sacred, (*sacer*,) holy, (*sanctus*,) religious, (*religiosus*.) To the assembly of the *Curiæ*, the presence of the augurs was, of course, indispensable; that of the *Centuries* could not be held, unless the augurs and two pontiffs assisted at it, as it was dissolved instantly at their bidding, on the occurrence of any sinister omen. The first *agrimensor*, says Niebuhr, was an augur, accompanied by Tuscan priests or their scholars. From the foundation of the city, the sacredness of property was shadowed forth in the worship of the god Terminus, and that of contracts protected by an apotheosis of Faith. In short, the worthy Roman lived, moved and had his being, as the Greek writers observe, in religion."

We have, as yet, made no allusion to the history of the Old Testament, because, while, as to its subject, it belongs to the East, it is, as to its origin, the word of God, and

therefore cannot be expected to contain any merely philosophical views upon this or upon any other question; and further, because the dispensation which it is its main purpose to reveal and to illustrate, was altogether peculiar, and was designed to be temporary. But the very fact that it contains the history of an oriental people, makes it specially instructive, if found to present or to imply views of the connexion of the civil and ecclesiastical powers different from those generally prevailing in the East. And the additional consideration that we have, in those venerable records, the primæval history of our race, will furnish an ample apology, if any apology be necessary, for a brief notice of it.

We learn, then, that the whole race was once confined to the limits of a single family, and that all the intricate and manifold relations of human society, which have been developed in the progress of civilization, once lay here in the germ. The family was the nursery both of the secular and the spiritual power. But these powers were combined in the person of the *paterfamilias*, who was both king and priest, governing and ordering his household in regard to the things of this life, and instructing them and leading them in the knowledge and worship of God. In process of time, even after the visible church had been formally set up in the family of Abraham, we meet with that mysterious person, Melchizedek, who was at once king of Salem and priest of the most high God. In him the powers of these twin ordinances of God, the Church and the State, appear still united, but discernible as distinct and separable. Then, under the institute of Moses, we find the sacerdotal functions given to a separate order of officers, and the whole ministry of the tabernacle to a particular tribe; while the elders, the representatives of the patriarchal system, seem to have continued the exercise of civil functions. We do not pretend that there was an entire separation of the secular and the spiritual. It is possible that the synagogue,

with its mingled jurisdiction over civil and ecclesiastical affairs, may even then have existed, as that jurisdiction was based on the patriarchal principle upon which the whole Hebrew commonwealth was organized. But we assert that we have here in the books of Moses, what we find no where else in the East, a class of high and honorable functions in the matter of divine worship, with which the highest officer in the State dared not intermeddle. It is certainly a striking circumstance that, in a theocracy like that of Israel, its public forms should recognise, to so great an extent, the distinction between civil and sacred functions. As a theocracy, it could not easily admit of their entire separation; and it must be borne in mind, that as the State was organized with a view to the interests of the Church as supreme, if any argument be drawn from Judaism in support of the union of Church and State, it is rather in favor of the ultramontane than of the Erastian theory. In this respect, paganism presents a strong contrast to Judaism, in giving supremacy to the civil. But in both, as also in Mahometanism, the two powers are so combined that their history cannot be separately written. There is no history of the synagogue, or the mosque, or the pagan temple, as there is of the Church.

So thoroughly rooted had the union of the two powers become by immemorial custom and tradition, in the thinking, feeling, and entire life of mankind, that there can be little doubt of the wisdom and love of that dispensation by which the Christian Church was exposed, almost from the beginning of its existence and for the first three hundred years of its career, to the bitter persecution of the civil power. The line was thus clearly drawn between God and Cæsar, and it was demonstrated that the Church could live not only without alliance with the State, but in spite of all its power and hate. But no sooner did Cæsar profess himself the friend of Christ and His cause, than the old idea of union was revived, and Cæsar assumed once more the

exercise of power in the Church of God. Then came the reaction of the human mind, too violent to rest in the centre of truth, and swinging to the opposite extreme; still holding to the union, but making the civil subordinate to the ecclesiastical. The popery of Hildebrand, of Innocent III, and Boniface VIII, was the Nemesis of the Erastianism of Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian. The doctrine, however, of these emperors was only the old Roman doctrine of the first centuries of the republic, with the change of Christianity for paganism. After the desperate struggle between the popes and the emperors, which kept the world in an uproar during the middle ages, came the earthquake of the Reformation. Even that great revolution did not dissolve the union of Church and State. It continued to exist, in some countries, as in Germany, Holland, England, and even in Scotland, to hinder the progress and mar the purity of the work of God, and in others, as in France, to extinguish it almost altogether.

It was in the Church of Scotland that the independence of the spiritual power was first proclaimed in modern times. John Erskine of Dun declared to the Regent Mar, "There is a spiritual jurisdiction and power which God has given unto His Kirk, and to them that bear office therein; and there is a temporal jurisdiction and power given of God to kings and civil magistrates. Both the powers are of God, and most agreeing to the fortifying one of the other, if they be rightly used." Andrew Melville dared to say to King James: "There are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland; there is King James, the head of the Commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member." (Stuart Robinson's Lecture before Maryland Institute, p. 18.) "For the space of more than a century," says Mr. Robinson, "this noble army of the martyrs attested the spiritual freedom of Christ's kingdom, in the face of every

effort of Cæsar to crush out the truth. But the seduction and arts of power at length accomplished what the violence of power could never do; and in the act of settlement of the Scottish kingdom under Queen Anne, the only testimony for this great truth was silenced, and in consequence, the Scotch church of the eighteenth century degenerated even to the point of spiritual death. Nothing could more forcibly illustrate the power of current and generally admitted error in blinding the eyes of intelligent men against the plainest results of their own principles, than the fact that, when the slavery of the Church to the power of the State could no longer be endured, and the memorable exodus of the Free Church of Scotland occurred, even then Chalmers and his compeers could not go all the length of the apostolic idea of church freedom; but clung, as indeed their disciples still cling, to the idea (while they practise voluntaryism) that the State should support the Church; as though it were possible for the Church to depend upon the State for support, and still be independent."

Such being the history of the case, it ought not to create surprise, if the public mind, even in the freest and most enlightened nations of modern times, should not appear to have a clear comprehension of the principles which control this subject, or that, in practice, there should be so great a neglect of those principles. Momentary glimpses of the truth may be discerned along the ages, even in the darkest ages, under the pressure of persecution, when the weak were compelled to take refuge from brute force under the ramparts of sound principles; but the light which shines clearly in the darkness is lost again in the blaze of recovered power, and the persecuted of yesterday are the persecutors of to-day. Decrees of councils, bulls of popes, rescripts of emperors, decisions of jurists, opinions of publicists, dogmas of the civil and dogmas of the canon law, all conspire to join together what God has put asunder—the things that are His and the things that are Cæsar's. And now, in

the middle of the nineteenth century, and in America, we who have been accustomed to boast that it was our mission as a people to teach the world the truth upon this subject, have witnessed among ourselves, if not the revival of the maxims of the canonists and civilians, at least the adoption of measures which can only be acquitted of atrocious wickedness and folly by the truth of those maxims. "So far," says Vattel, "as religion is seated in the heart, it is an affair of the conscience, in which every one should be directed by his own understanding; but so far as it is external and publicly established, it is an affair of the State." It is upon this maxim that the officers of the usurper at Washington have proceeded, when they have dragged from their pulpits and banished from their churches the ministers of Christ, because their prayers sinned against political orthodoxy, either in the way of omission or of commission. And on the other hand, the Church, forgetting that her power is strictly a power only to declare and do her Master's will, as revealed in His word, has usurped the functions of the State, and fulminated its curses against all who hold the heresy of State sovereignty. Then, among ourselves of the Southern Confederacy, there are those who seem ambitious to revive the absurdities of the Fifth Monarchy fanatics, and to exclude from the councils of the State all except the saints; and others, who speak as if a particular form of religion were destined to be the religion of the Southern Confederacy, or, at least, of its army and navy. And doubtless there are among us, as in the old Union, tender-conscienced atheists also, who are shocked at the recognition of a God at all in the administration of the government.

All these facts go to show the importance of standing and looking for the old paths, that we may walk therein. The revolutionary temper of the public mind prompts us to look for something new; but we want nothing new. We are not Jacobin destroyers, despising the wisdom of

the past; but like William the Silent and the Dutch, like Hampden and Sidney and Somers, like Washington and the glorious fathers of the first war for independence, it is our mission to "maintain" and to restore. We need no new principles; but we do need to review and to remember the old, to refresh ourselves and renew our youth at the fountain of truth. This is our apology, for asking the attention of our countrymen once more to the principles which constitute a true theory, or an approximation to a true theory, of the connexion of Church and State. We say an *approximation* to a true theory, because there is room for doubt whether a scientific expression can be given to the nature and limitations of either Church or State, so clear and so sharply defined as to afford rules of universal application. One of the factors of the problem still waits for a thorough analysis and construction; and the political history of this country would seem to demonstrate that we do not comprehend the nature of the State. But we may approach the truth by considering the points in which the Church and the State agree, and then the points in which they differ.

I. The Church and the State agree in these three points: 1. That they are ordained of God. 2. That they are ordained for His glory. 3. That they are ordained for the good of mankind. These statements will not be disputed by any of our readers; and we shall not stop to argue them.

II. They differ in the following points:

1. That the State is an ordinance of God considered as the creator, and, therefore, the moral governor of mankind; while the Church is an ordinance of God considered as the saviour and the restorer of mankind. The State is ordained for man as man; the Church for man as a sinner in a condition of inchoate restoration and salvation. The State is for the whole race of man; the Church consists of that portion of the race which is really, or by credible profession, the mediatorial body of Christ.

We say that civil government is designed for man as man. We find it existing in the germ, when the race consisted of one man and one woman. The woman was in a state of subordination to the man. This subordination was not the penal consequence of transgression, as is evident from 1 Timothy, 2 : 11–14, where Paul argues that the transgression was the consequence of the violation, by the woman, of the order established by Heaven; of her ambitiously forsaking her condition of subordination, and acting as if she were the superior or the equal of the man. If it should be asked where was the necessity or the propriety of an order implying subordination, in beings who were created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, the answer is, that the propriety was founded upon the diversities of capacity in intellect and other endowments of human nature, which it pleased God should exist in the man and the woman. If man had not fallen, it would have been his duty still to bring up his children in the knowledge of God, and to *direct* them in the way in which they should glorify their Maker, albeit these children, by the terms of the supposition, would all have been holy and without inclination to go astray; nay, more, in no danger at all of apostasy from God. In other words, if all creatures, because they are creatures, need direction from God, there is not only no absurdity in making some of them the instruments of directing others, but there are traces of the wonderful wisdom and goodness of the Creator in such an arrangement. Society is not an unison, but an exquisite harmony; a grand instrument of various chords for the harping of hymns and hallelujahs to the God and Father of all. Even among the unfallen angels, we have reason to believe, there are thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers—order in the form of a celestial hierarchy. Man having fallen, however, and the love which constituted the very spirit and temper of his mind having given place to enmity, something more than *direction* was now necessary.

He needed *restraint*—his appetites must be bridled and coerced. The law of the two tables, which, in his state of innocence and uprightness, had been written upon his heart, summarily, in the *positive* form of *love*, must now be written externally, in detail, upon tablets of stone, and in a *prohibitory* form—"thou shalt *not*." And in reference to the second table, which prescribes the duties growing out of the relations of man to man, it became necessary that overt acts of transgression, which were not only morally wrong, but injurious to society, should not only be discountenanced by prohibition, but restrained and prevented by punishment. Hence arose a government of force.

The case, then, stands thus: In any condition of our race, the social nature of man must have given rise to the secular power. In a state of innocence, it would have been simply a *directing* power, a constitution designed merely to carry out and fulfil, without confusion, the blind instincts or impulses of love, love of self and love of "neighbor." In a fallen state, it has become, of necessity, a *restraining* and *punishing*, as well as a directing power. But in both conditions and in both forms, it is an ordinance of God, "the author of the constitution and course of nature." It is the nature of man to exist in society, and society is necessary to his existence. But society cannot exist without order and law of some sort. Therefore, government is as necessary to man as society, and, for this reason, is as natural to man as society. It may not be an *original* endowment of man, but it is *natural*; and if natural, then the ordinance of God. The perception of distance by the eye is not an *original* endowment of man, but the organ is so constituted that, in the course of time, it necessarily acquires it; and it is, therefore, *natural* to man, and therefore the ordinance of God. Civil government, then, is a branch or department of the moral government of God, the creator and ruler over man. God governs man by mechanical laws, by chemical laws, by vital laws, and He governs

him by civil laws. He who leaps from a precipice, or drinks a glass of poison, and dies, dies under a law of God which *executes itself.* He who murders his brother, and dies on the gallows, dies under a law of God, *executed by the hand of man.* In all these cases, death is a penalty inflicted by God for the violation of a rule of His government, physical or moral.

Once more: If this be a just view of the subject, civil government is a great *moral* institute, not a mere expedient of human sagacity and wisdom for the prevention of evil. It is this low, wretched, utilitarian view, which has contributed its full share to the ruin of the late United States government, in which the criminal law was fast becoming as pure an affair of utilitarian regulation as the civil. But the government of God, as creator, is a government of justice; and the civil magistrate, who is His minister, servant, διακονος, has no right to inflict any punishment which justice does not sanction, and is bound to inflict the punishment which justice requires. This remark is made for the sake of one important inference, and that is, that every civil government on earth is bound explicitly to recognise its responsibility to God as the moral governor of mankind. It is perfectly monstrous that the power which bears the sword and assumes the awful prerogative of taking human life, either in peace or war, should not acknowledge itself to be the servant of the sovereign Lord of life and death; that the power which represents the majesty of justice, should not recognise its responsibility to Him who is the eternal fountain and standard of all righteousness. One of the sins, doubtless, for which the vengeance of God descended upon the late Federal government, was the atheism of its fundamental law; and it is a matter of devout thanksgiving unto God, that the people of the new Confederacy have had the grace given to them explicitly to acknowledge their dependence upon Him, both in their Confederate Constitution and in their Confederate escut-

cheon. We have written "*Deo vindice*" upon the flag which our noble countrymen have borne aloft on a hundred bloody and victorious battle-fields. Let us never forget that God, our "Vindex," is the punisher of our sins, as well as the protector of our rights, and the avenger of our wrongs. Let us also remember, that it is not enough to bear this solemn truth upon our banners; we must bear it upon our hearts, lest we meet the fate of those of old, who "flattered Him with their mouths, and lied unto Him with their tongues."

So much for civil government as the ordinance of God, the creator, preserver, and moral governor of mankind. The Church differs from it in this, as has been said, that it is the ordinance of God, as the saviour of men, in the person of Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son. It contemplates man, not as upright, in his original condition of innocence, nor simply as a fallen being, but as "the prisoner of hope;" or more strictly still, as the "heir of salvation," really or by credible profession. Its great function is to teach, to convince, to persuade, "to bear witness to the truth." Its triumphs are the triumphs of love; it drags no reluctant captives at the wheels of its chariot; the design of its ordinances, its oracles, its ministry, is, through the efficacious operation of the Holy Ghost, to bring its captives into hearty sympathy with its King, and so to give them a share in the glory and exultation of the triumphs of the King. It has nothing to do with the power of the *sword;* its symbol is the *keys.* Its discipline is not the discipline of avenging justice, asserting the unbending majesty of the law, but the discipline of a mother, whose bowels yearn over the wayward child, and who inflicts no pain except for the child's reformation and salvation. The authority of her King is spiritual. His voice is, "Son, give me thy *heart;*" and by the power of His Spirit, He sweetly and powerfully constrains those whom He chooses for members of His kingdom, "to call Him Lord." They who

are His, or profess to be His, have, or make a credible profession of having, the great law of love written upon their hearts, and, therefore, need more the *directing* than the *restraining* power of the law.

The difference in this point between the civil and the ecclesiastical power, may throw some light on the question which has been agitated in our church of late, as to the duty of recognising the kingly office of Christ our Lord, in the civil constitutions of the country. Christians are all agreed that Jesus, their Saviour, is King of kings and Lord of lords, not only in the sense that He is the greatest of kings, but in the sense that all earthly kings and lords are subject to His authority. But the question is, whether civil rulers derive their authority from Him, as Mediator, or whether they derive their authority from God, as moral governor of mankind. The latter seems to us to be the truth. Christ says that, "His kingdom is not of this world." This is His solemn testimony before a civil magistrate whose authority He recognises. (See John 19 : 10, 11; Rom. 13 : 1, etc.) Now, was Pilate, as a representative of the Roman government, acting as an officer of the kingdom of Christ? If so, to what perplexity are we reduced in the interpretation of such a text as John 18 : 35–37? If any authority is "of this world," it certainly is the authority of the civil magistrate. If it should be said, that as Christ is "*head* over *all* things unto the Church," His supreme headship should be acknowledged by all "powers that be;" we answer, first, that it ought to be done where it can be honestly and truly done; and we doubt not that the day is coming, when all "the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ," and "all kings shall fall down before Him, and all nations shall serve Him." But how is it now? "No man calleth Jesus Lord but by the Holy Ghost," says Paul, in 1 Cor. 12 : 1. Are there more than a very small minority of the people of the Confederate States, who are, in the judgment

of charity, persuaded by the Holy Ghost that our blessed Saviour is Lord and King? What then? Will the acknowledgment of Christ in the Constitution make us a "Christian nation?" Have not the kings of France enjoyed the titles of "eldest sons of the Church," and "most Christian kings?" What shall we say of Henry VIII and Philip II? O Christ! what crimes have been committed in thy name! No; there is no magic in the name of Christ emblazoned in our Constitution and on our banners to transform us into a Christian people. Many a foul heart has beaten under the "cross" of the Crusader; fouler far than beat under the crescent of the Saracen. To make the change proposed in our Constitution, would have one of two effects: either to make us a nation of hypocrites, or to exclude from our public service every sort of ability which was not found associated with a cordial reception of Christ as King, or, at least, with a sincere recognition of His authority. Are we prepared for either alternative? We believe that as civil government was ordained for all men, and not for the saints only; as there is a moral constitution in all men which responds to the authority of God as moral governor, and they can recognise Him as such without the saving power of the Holy Ghost; and as God, the God of nature and providence, has endowed men with capacity for government who are not Christians; all that is necessary, in the way of an explicit acknowledgment of responsibility, is the acknowledgment of our responsibility to God as the governor of nations. But we shall have more to say on this subject under the next head.

2. The next point of difference between Church and State, is in the rules by which they are to be respectively regulated in the exercise of their functions. The rule for the Church is the word of God, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. This is the statute book of the visible kingdom of Christ. The rule for the State is the "light of nature," or the human reason. The power of the Church

is, strictly and only, "ministerial and declarative;" the power of the State is magisterial and imperative. The Church has no power to *make* laws, but only to *declare* the law of God. All her acts of government are acts of obedience to her Head and King. The State has the power to make laws, as well as to declare them; has a legislative as well as a judicial power. Hence, the form of government for the Church, the regulative and the constitutive principles of her organization, are not matters to be determined by human reason, but to be derived from the Bible as the constitution and statute book: while, in the State, these are matters to be settled by the history and condition of political communities. The life of the State is natural, and it is left to assume an organization for itself. The life of the Church is supernatural, and God prescribes an organization for it.

If it should be asked, whether the Bible is no rule for the civil power—whether the secular magistrate may proceed, in all cases, as if God had not revealed His will in writing—the answer is: assuredly not. In the first place, the light of nature is made much more clear by the revealed will of God. For example, in respect to the justice and expediency of capital punishment for the crime of murder; the Bible not only gives its sanction to this penalty, but makes it the duty of the magistrate, as the sword-bearer, to inflict it. So also as to the lawfulness of defensive war. The sword-bearer is bound to wage such a war. According to the light of nature, interpreted by the Bible, the Quaker theory of war is not merely a sickly sentimentalism, but a rebellion against the organic law of society and government. The law of marriage is another example. In the second place, the erroneous teaching of the light of nature is rectified by the Bible. In the case of a weekly rest, for example, the word of God demonstrates that such a rest belongs to man as man, was ordained before his fall, and is necessary to his well-being. Reason and experience

have amply demonstrated the same truth, that "the Sabbath was made for man;" but it is doubtful whether the fact would have been recognised by the light of nature alone. In the third place, every man who has received this revelation is bound to accept it as a revelation from God, and to regulate his faith and practice by its authority, either in a positive or in a negative way. In some of his duties, the Bible is a positive rule; in others, it is a negative rule. Touching the whole matter of the method of salvation, the whole question as to what is necessary to be believed or done in order to obtain eternal life, the Scriptures are a *positive* guide, teaching what is to be believed or done, and *all* that is to be believed or done to that end. Touching the life that now is, the avocations necessary to sustain the being or to promote the well-being of society, agriculture, commerce, manufactures, civil and criminal laws, the man, if he be a civil magistrate, or whatever else, is to be governed by the *negative* authority of the Bible. He can do any thing which the Bible does not *forbid.* The principle contended for by Hooker and the Court party, in the time of Elizabeth, against Cartwright and the Puritans, for the regulation of the Church, though a false one for the Church, was true in application to the State,—that any thing may be lawfully ordained which is not forbidden in the Word. We say false in its application to the Church, because contrary to the injunction that "nothing be added to the requirements of God:" the Word being a *positive* charter, and therefore signifying prohibition by *silence.* It is true in its application to the State, because the Bible is not, for the State, a *positive* rule.

Let us now, for a moment, return to the question which has been discussed, and consider it in the light of those principles. Should the supremacy of Christ, as King of kings, and the supreme authority of the Bible, be formally and explicitly acknowledged in our civil constitutions? We answer, again:

1. By all means, if it can be truly and honestly done. If all the sovereign people could say "amen," as heartily, or even as sincerely, to such an addition to the section on "liberty of conscience," as they do to the section as it now stands in the Constitution, there would be no objection to it, except that it was not necessary—that it was not an essential function of a civil constitution to make such a declaration. If the body that framed the Constitution had been able sincerely to declare, in presenting it to the States for their ratification, that they, the members of that body, had felt their responsibility to Christ as king, in framing that document, such a declaration would have been a noble testimony from individual citizens, and a happy augury for the people. But, evidently, the value of such a testimony would depend upon its *sincerity;* and to have introduced it into the constitution itself as the solemn utterance of "we, the people," when it was notorious that not one-half of the people even professed to believe it, what were this but to incorporate hypocrisy in the fundamental law? Would to God that our statesmen, who profess to be Christians, might be more courageous, as individuals, in bearing their testimony for Christ!

2. As the doctrine of the supremacy of Christ is a doctrine of pure revelation, it forms no part of the essential functions of civil government to teach it, or profess it. The supremacy of Christ is founded upon His work as a priest, for the salvation of His elect. The State is a branch of the moral government of God, as the righteous judge of all, and is bound to recognise God only in this capacity. The Church, which is the body, or professes to be the body of the saved, is bound to recognise the Saviour, prophet, priest, and king. This is her very vocation, to be a witness-bearer, and the Bible regulates her testimony and her profession. The State must not contradict her testimony; and that is all the State is bound to do. What is the definition of the Church visible, in the Westminster Confession of

Faith? "The visible Church consists of all those throughout the world that *profess the true religion*, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, etc." Now, if our brethren could carry their point, the State and Church would be, at least logically, confounded; for the same definition would answer, in a great degree, to both of them. They both *profess the true religion*, that is, the revealed religion of *salvation*, with mercy, and not justice, as its prominent feature. Nor is the proposed profession of the State a meagre one. Implicitly, it is the whole Gospel; explicitly, it is as full as was the profession of the Church for hundreds of years. And if the State begins to make a profession of the Christian religion, it is impossible to predict where it will stop. The only safety for liberty and for religion, is in rigidly enforcing the maxim that the Bible is, in the sense already illustrated, a *positive* rule for the Church, a *negative* rule for the State.

But we are asked, if the State is bound to respect the negative authority of the Scriptures, where is the impropriety in her *professing* that respect? We answer, that it is one thing to be *bound* to perform a duty, and quite another thing to be *prepared* to perform it. Every man who hears the Gospel is bound to confess Christ before man; but we are in the habit of warning men against coming to the Lord's table, unless they are believers. We repeat, that the Church is the body whose vocation it is to profess faith in Christ and in His word; and any other doctrine will have the effect of confounding the Church and the State. If any legislator, or judge, or governor, chooses to profess his responsibility to Christ for his own public acts, a responsibility he really feels, let him do it. We should render our hearty thanks to God for every judicious public act of this kind. But let it be remembered that it is his own personal responsibility he is confessing, and that he is not speaking for those who feel no such responsibility.

It may be added, that we have not intended, in any thing that has been said, to deny that the State is a moral personality; that there is an "organic life," or a "public conscience," belonging to political communities. All this is freely admitted. But it has been shown, we think, that this moral personality is subject to the government of God as a government of justice, of natural justice; that this public conscience and organic life are to be regulated and controlled by the light of nature, interpreted and corrected by the word of God, when the State is in possession of that word.

The view advocated by some of our brethren, of the personality of the State, which makes it something totally different at once from the administration at any given time, and from the whole body of the people, so that the State may be Christian while the administration and the people are Jews, Turks, or atheists, is a view which passes our comprehension. Such a theory might, with some color of plausibility, be maintained under a despotism like that of Louis XIV, of France, who boasted that he was the State. But what is the State, according to the Confederate Constitution? What is the State, according to the terms of the proposed amendment to the article on liberty of conscience? These are the terms: "Nevertheless, we, the *people of these Confederate States*, distinctly acknowledge our responsibility to God, and the supremacy of His Son, Jesus Christ, as King of kings and Lord of lords; and hereby ordain that no law shall be passed by the Congress of these Confederate States inconsistent with the will of God, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures." What can be clearer than that the State, here, is the "*people* of the Confederate States?" Not the whole mass of the population—women, children, foreigners, slaves—but the political corporation, the *populus*, the *demus*, the body of voters—a minority of the whole population. Now, of this minority a large majority are rebels against Christ. Yet this is the body,

whose religion, it is insisted, must be the Christian religion, whatever the religion or no-religion of the people may be! It is the body, at least, which must *profess* the Christian religion! Or shall we say that the Constitution itself, the parchment roll on which the fundamental law is written, is the State, whose religion is Christian, although "the people" who ordain it are not? We confess that all this sounds to us very much like the old realism of the schools, which asserted for abstract ideas a substantive existence, different from and independent of the concrete things in which they were manifested and exemplified. We say this with a veneration amounting to awe, for the memory of that great genius and noble man of God, whose illustrious name gives support to this movement for an amendment of the Confederate Constitution.

The two points of difference, which we have attempted to illustrate, between the civil and the ecclesiastical power, comprehend some others, which, although already incidentally referred to, are worthy of an articulate statement. For example:

3. The Church and the State differ in their *sanctions*, as well as in their *authority* and their *rule*. The sanction of ecclesiastical government is *moral*, appealing to the faith and the conscience, a parental *discipline*, designed for the good of the offender. Its symbol is the "*keys*." The sanction of civil government is *force*, appealing to the bodily sensibilities of the subject or the citizen; a *penal* administration, designed to vindicate the majesty of justice and the supremacy of law, with a very incidental, if any, reference to the good of the transgressor. Its symbol is the "*sword*." It is so perfectly obvious that the employment of force is abhorrent, from the whole nature and genius of the Church, that even the fiends of the "Holy Office" were compelled to profess the greatest horror of shedding the blood of heretics, and piously turned them over to the secular arm.

4. "The scope and aim of civil power is only things *temporal;* of the ecclesiastical power, only things *spiritual. Religious* is a term not predicable of acts of the State; *political* and *civil,* not predicable of acts of the Church." (See Robinson, *ut supra.*) The proclamation of the President in regard to days of fasting and prayer is a religious act; but then it is not an act of government. It is merely an invitation or request, addressed by a citizen in high place, to his fellow-citizens. If it were done as an act of government, it would be a usurpation of the prerogative of the Church. On the other hand, if the Church does a political act, it is guilty of a usurpation of the prerogatives of the State. Rebellion—(which, by the way, is a totally different thing from revolution, the latter always implying the existence of a civil government, under whose authority the revolutionists are acting, and thereby excluding the very idea of treason)—rebellion is always a *sin,* as well as a *crime;* and a church member may be disciplined for rebellion, but the fact must first be found by the civil authority and accepted by the Church. Nothing can be more presumptuous and absurd, than the decision by a church court sitting in the city of Philadelphia, as to the allegiance of one of its members, who is a citizen of Virginia. If he is obeying the laws of the State of which he is a citizen, no power on earth can convict him of the crime either of treason or rebellion. One more illustration may be added. The act by which ministers of the gospel, as such, are excluded in some of the States of this Confederacy, perhaps in all, from civil office, is an usurpation, by the civil power, of the functions of the Church. If it be a sin, an infraction of solemn vows, for ministers to hold civil office, as we believe it is, it is, nevertheless, a sin which it is the function of the Church, not of the State, to rebuke. As to the grounds of expediency upon which this disfranchisement of ministers has been defended, we only say that the history of the world, if candidly studied, will show that the Church is in much

greater danger from the ambition, or the stupidity of politicians, than the State is, from the ambition or avarice of ecclesiastics.

But enough. The theory of Church and State illustrated in the foregoing pages is the Virginia doctrine, as we understand it—the doctrine of the Presbytery of Hanover, in their memorials to the legislature of that grand old Commonwealth, from 1775 to 1785, in which last year Mr. Jefferson's "Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom" became a law. It has been called the "American" theory; but the history of the Northern States has shown, that the current theory there, has been rather the "semi-theocracy" of New England, according to which, as Mr. Robinson observes, "the Church becomes an agency for keeping the proper party in power, a congress-managing society, a public-opinion-manufacturing society. Hence its three-thousand-clergymen's-memorial-to-Congress; its religious press devoted to Fremontism, and its treasury of religious funds to carry the election in Pennsylvania."

Whether the views expressed in this article be sound or not, there can be but one opinion among intelligent men as to the necessity of reviewing these old controversies, and of feeling, once more, for our foundations. If what we have written should contribute, in the smallest degree, to a safe and satisfactory conclusion, we shall be amply rewarded for our trouble.

ARTICLE II.

A SLAVE MARRIAGE LAW.

We accept the Address on "Slavery, and the Duties growing out of the Relation," published in the July number of this Review, as the first fruits of the new era in our discussions of that interesting topic. Embarrassed hitherto by our political connexion with the puritanical Yankees; engaged, for the most part, in fortifying the scriptural lawfulness of the institution; and struggling to secure our rights, under the late constitutional compact of union, in respect to this species of property, against the insidious attacks of our faithless associates: the abuses incident to the relation, and the remedies for them, if not virtually tabooed amongst us, have been at least subordinated to other more menacing aspects of the angry controversy.

It must be so no longer. We must look into the private management of our negroes with fresh diligence. We must subject our slave codes to a rigid inspection; criticism must be free and bold; abuses must be exposed; and the inner life of slavery reformed and restored, as far as may be, to the pattern shown us in the Bible. We ought to do this upon our distinct accountability to God, and with the best lights afforded by our own experience; not out of vain respect, as some would have us do, to the prejudices of enemies, or weak brethren, or to save fair appearances. If we begin our work from any such motives as these last, we shall do nothing but blunder. We can not hope, do what we may, to win for our cause the good opinion of the self-righteous, abolitionized people of the United States, or their yoke-fellows of England, unless we take the fatal step

of emancipation. Wrapped in the ample folds of their pride and self-conceit, these intermeddling nations realize the worst form of hypocrisy:

> "Compounding for sins they are inclined to,
> By damning those they have no mind to."

"Without are dogs." We especially of the Confederacy, who ought to know something of slavery, have committed the unpardonable sin of setting at naught their counsel and their example in this very matter. We have presumed to think for ourselves. We have presumed to prefer Moses to Wilberforce, and Paul to Beecher. That is enough. We are worse than dogs. We may now go forward, so far as any favorable effect upon them towards ourselves is concerned, to deal with our outlawed institution in our own way, as completely as if no such people were in existence.

The Address breaks the new ground well. We commend its general positions entirely. We are sorry, however, where we find so much to approve, that there should be even one thing from which we must dissent. But we deem the propositions to regulate the marriage of slaves by law, as fraught with imminent danger to that very feature of our slavery which really determines the character and destiny of the whole system: as we will now proceed to show.

Slavery, as it exists among us, is a *domestic* institution. This remark is so familiar, that we fear its significance is not felt or understood. It may be worth while, therefore, to give it some emphasis. We mean then, that the slave is, with us, the subject of family government, and not of political government. The family is his State. The master is his law-giver. He is in no sense a member of municipal society, but of the household estate. We have, it is true, somewhat abridged the master's natural power in respect to the punishment of crimes committed by the slave. Of these, at least of the higher sort, the State, through her courts, takes cognizance in like manner as of those com-

mitted by freemen. Yet even here we have not gone far, but still wisely leave the mass of small offences and misdemeanors to the mild, though summary, jurisdiction of the master. This abridgement, moreover, no matter to what extent it may be carried, is grounded upon the vindication of public justice, and the prevention of public wrongs; and can hardly be deemed a modification of the domestic character of our system. But whatever cognizance the criminal law may take of the slave, it is a principle which goes to the very foundation of the institution, and permeates its whole superstructure, that the civil code absolutely no where recognises his presence in the body politic, except as property. It accords to him no rights; it exacts of him no duties; it accepts and treats him, in all civil respects, as a grown-up and life-long child.

Now, it is evident that a legal recognition of marriage among slaves, would be the first and decisive step towards a total inversion of the relation of that class to the State and to the family. Marriage is based upon contract; and hence such a regulation would at once introduce the slave to our notice as legally capable of contracting civil obligations, and as liable to civil duties. The extent of this change may be perceived at a glance. It would amount to a revolution in the status of the slave, as great as a transfer of allegiance from one prince or state to another would effect in the condition of a free people. As great, we repeat, in theory; but practically, it would be attended with consequences perhaps incalculably greater. A transfer of allegiance in the one case might be made, as it often has been made, without a shock or a jar to the social order. We can not hope for any such quiet result in the other case. For, to remove the legal incapacity of the slave to contract, would be to overthrow a distinctive fundamental principle of domestic slavery; to confuse our jurisprudence with an illogical jargon, and to let in as a flood many of the evils of a virtual emancipation. The door once opened—the

threshold once passed—where do you purpose to stop? where can you stop, consistently with your premises? You say that not to legalize marriage is in some way to deny a natural right. Granted, for the sake of the argument. There are other things quite as natural as the affections which prompt us to marry. The right of private property, for example: the law of *meum* and *tuum* is even more deeply imbedded in human nature, and more universal among mankind, than the passions involved in the continuation of the species. What then? Must we legally accord this natural right also to slaves? Must the law authorize them to acquire property, to hold it, to alienate it, to transmit it by blood or will? Must the legislature put in motion the costly apparatus of judicial actions and remedies, to enforce their contracts and to redress their injuries respecting property? Such folly finds no advocates. It would evidently amount to a declaration of civil freedom to a person yet supposed to be held in pure bondage; and no legislator or judge could see his way clear amid the cloud of unending confusions and contradictious perplexities with which it would envelope our simple and well-ordered system. Yet a slave marriage law would, upon principle, lead us straight to this consummation.

Of course it would be useless to enact such a statute, without providing some means of enforcing its observance and of punishing its violations. Has any body thoughtfully considered the extremities which must beset the legislature in that task? Take the correlative right of *divorce*—how will you adjust that among married slaves? Some States do not allow divorce for any cause between free persons. That will never do between slaves, manifestly. They would be sure to think it is not good to marry at all, and to neglect their newly acquired legal rights altogether. We should have to moderate our legislation in this behalf, according to the profound unannulled precept of Moses, to suit the hardness of their hearts. But we have never yet

heard a wise man venture a suggestion as to what that legislation ought to be. Possibly, however, you may succeed in the frame work of a statute well enough on paper. But when you come to its practical administration in the courts, how will you avoid the difficulty of thronging those tribunals with *slaves*, as parties litigant to *civil* suits? This glaring self-contradiction can be avoided but in one way. The legislature might authorize the solemnization of marriage between slaves; and then leave all the rest—the terms of separation or dissolution of the contract—to the will or discretion of the master, as we do now. But what good could this poor contrivance do? It would still be bottomed upon the absurdity that the slave has legal capacity to contract; nor would it prevent or mitigate a single evil of our present system, for it would leave the master in full possession of his authority over his slaves—the very thing complained of.

This then, is our capital objection to a slave marriage law. We think the reasoning by which it is sustained admits of no reply. It would snap at once the tie that binds the slave to the family, and place him, as the subject of civil legislation, under the dominion of the State. From that unlucky moment we may date the decay of *domestic* slavery, until the whole fabric would totter to its base, or fall, "like the sudden downcome of a tower," with vast and hideous ruin. *Political* slavery—for slavery of some kind is the normal condition of the negro—would supervene (if we may change the figure) with its social ulcers and rank gangrene.

Let us come now to some of those considerations which are urged in favor of a legal regulation of marriage among slaves. The most important is, that our legislative disregard of this relation is unnatural and unscriptural. This position is not stated in any distinct form of argument that we can lay hold of, but exists in the popular mind as a sort of floating imagination, and is always expressed in those

vague general terms, so convenient to reformers who are either unable or afraid to bring their projects to the touchstone of reason and truth. The position deserves the most thorough and candid investigation. If true, it consigns to infamy, along with ourselves, all those departed generations of worthy Christians, who, since the establishment of African slavery on this continent, have winked at open uncleanness and adultery over the whole land and in their very households.

Let us distinctly understand what our law does in the premises. That it does not commit any *positive* violation of nature and Scripture, will be admitted on all hands. The most that can be charged is, that in our marriage code the slave is ignored. And from this pretermission it is inferred that our legislation "sets at defiance the precepts of the Bible, the dictates of nature, and the moral sentiment of humanity." This inference rests upon the false assumption that a legal recognition is somehow or other essential to the moral validity of marriage. And this assumption is, in turn, the product of confused ideas concerning the nature of marriage, as contemplated by human law and moral law.

The former treats it as a civil institute for the welfare of society; the latter as a religious institute for the health of the soul. When the legislature elaborately prescribes what persons shall contract marriage, and at what ages; with what forms and ceremonies the rite must be solemnized; upon what terms the tie shall be impaired or dissolved; and to say all in a few words, what shall be the reciprocal rights and duties arising out of the relation; it proceeds purely upon political considerations, designed to secure, as far as may be, the peace, the order, and the increase of the commonwealth. As these objects are quite within the scope of unaided human wisdom, it is probable, if we had no Bible, our regulations would not be much different from what they are in our actual circumstances. When civil purposes fail, the end of the law for marriage fails also.

And it seems not more self-absurd to encumber the statute-book with a marriage law for cattle than for slaves, who are equally without civil capacity. But when we contemplate the marriage institution from a moral stand-point, we see it designed, in its divine origin and end, as a help-meet not so much for the citizen as for man, and less for the body than for the immortal spirit. It draws its obligations from a source infinitely higher than human authority. God himself is its author. It needs not the witness of men; God himself is its witness. It needs not the cementing ministry of magistrate or priest, but the holy joining of the Lord. The nuptial torch, though unsolemnized by legal forms, may be lighted with as pure a flame as ever burned upon the altars of lawful wedlock. *Consensus facit nuptias*, is the simple fundamental maxim in the league of marriage. Hence we conclude that there is, in moral contemplation, a wide distinction between the faithful cohabition of our slaves as man and wife, though unrecognised in law, and a promiscuous sexual intercourse; and that such connexions, notwithstanding the want of legal sanction, are valid *in foro conscientiae*, and conformable to the word of God.

Fortunately, the sacred volume does not leave us to mere deductions, but furnishes a system of practical legislation adapted to a people conditioned as we are in respect to slavery. And it may have escaped those whose squeamish humanity is ready to belch forth its sour crudities at our polity, that Moses is in like condemnation. It seems clear that his marriage laws were framed wholly with reference to the free-born population, and ignored the slave as much as ours. Let us not be misunderstood. We meet, indeed, in the Hebrew law with allusions to marriage among slaves; but it is among Hebrew slaves, who lost in their bondage only their liberty temporarily, and none of their civil rights. They might be restored at any time to full citizenship by right of redemption, and certainly would be so restored at the sabbatical year. Moses was strictly consistent with

himself, therefore, in recognising marriage among this class. But as respects the other class, purchased of the heathen round about, who were pure bond-men forever without civil rights, and to whom neither the sabbatical year nor sound of jubilee ever brought liberty, there is no where a hint that the Hebrew marriage law comprehended them. To comment on the proof-texts, if we had space, which we have not, or ability, which we have not, would be irksome. We beg the curious, therefore, to read over the Mosaic legislation, with an eye single to this point, and judge for themselves.

This Hebrew procedure is, in a manner, gospelized to us from what we observe in the New Testament. Rome, it is known, tolerated slavery. Her iron law did not recognise the marriage relation among slaves. There was, however, a relation recognised, which the Romans called *contubernium.* It was nothing but the unauthorized cohabitation between slaves as husband and wife, *conjugium* being their term to express the lawful estate of matrimony between free persons. Now this *contubernium*, which Christ and His apostles met with in every family and country of the empire, where they went about doing good and teaching truth, is very analogous to that matrimonial state obtaining among our slaves, which, for want of a corresponding accuracy in our language, we call *marriage.* We have no single word which expresses the idea. If the relation was immoral, it was a sin second in openness and universality to idolatry only. That it has been passed over in the New Testament without rebuke or censure, must be admitted. That we do not find, in the frequent allusions to the rights and duties arising out of slavery, an intimation condemnatory of an evil so wide-spread and monstrous, can not be denied. What may we infer from this omission? It is hardly possible to answer but in one way. The relation itself was not sinful.

It is proper, in concluding this part of the subject, to observe that, when we say our law ignores the marriage relation between slaves, the assertion must be taken with some qualification. We give it, indeed, several side-wise recognitions. It is so far favored, for example, in the administration of the criminal law as to entitle the slave, in a case of homicide, to the benefit of the rule, that when a person finds one in the act of adultery with his wife, and instantly kills him, it is not murder, but manslaughter only.

Thus the *contubernial* relation, recognised by public opinion, and favored to a certain degree in law, is evidently neither defiant of Scripture nor shocking to nature or humanity. While it fits well with the normal and legal status of the slave, it gives full play to all his proper passions and affections. There is not a solace or delight known to the pure nuptial bed; there is not a joy or attachment, which the cheerful conversation of man with woman in connubial life is calculated to afford, but may find here a healthful fruition and development. And who has failed to witness frequently in the cabins of the slave as beautiful instances of conjugal love and helpfulness as ever adorned the goodly mansions of the free-born? Abuses there are, we allow—great abuses and deplorably general. Can it be shown, however, that these will be lessened in number or magnitude by the proposed experiment? What we want here is not a rambling disquisition, or an ornate encomium upon the blessings of lawful matrimony—much of which may truthfully be said of the *contubernial* state—but something like an accurate and intelligible balance struck between what we shall gain and what we shall lose by the change referred to. Let us, then, pursue the subject a step or two farther.

It is urged as another consideration for the legal recognition of marriage among slaves, that it would prevent the ruthless separation of husband and wife. It would do so, perhaps; but it would also ruthlessly fasten upon many a

family and plantation the intolerable curse of an incorrigibly bad negro, rendered more desperately vicious by the consciousness that the State had interposed to make him a fixture. There is a conflict of laws—the law of marriage and the law of property. The difficulty is to reconcile the inseparableness of the marriage relation between slaves, with the master's paramount right of ownership in them, as property. Perhaps it can be done. It is exceedingly hard to judge of the practical value of a suggestion upon so nice a point, unless we have the law in a concrete form before us, in order to compare its several provisions with each other, and test their adaptation to the end proposed. We can only say, that all we have yet heard would amount, in our judgment, but to a snare to entangle the good and conscientious master, while it would serve as a mere cobweb for the wicked and mercenary. We must reserve, however, any further discussion of the point, until some thing distinct and tangible is proposed by way of reconciling the conflict which we have indicated. But the truth is, this evil of separating families is greatly overrated. We are slow to believe that, in the complex machinery of human affairs, many things which look theoretically wrong work practically right. The master is armed with the unlimited power in law to separate husband and wife, parent and child; and under some undefined notion that this is wrong, without much calculation of actual results, or carrying our investigation below the surface of appearances, we hasten to conclude that to exercise this power wantonly, in spite of the tears and heart-agonies of helpless human beings, must become a debased appetite that grows by what it feeds on. The history and existing facts, as well as the true philosophy of domestic servitude, contradict this senseless theory.

Even among the Romans, whose slave code was the severest ever known to a civilized people, giving the owner the supreme power of life and death over his slave, the re-

lation was nevertheless, in the main, one of mutual kindness and consideration. Cruel abuses of this power did occur, undoubtedly; but they were not frequent, as dull fools are apt to suppose; and we believe every recorded instance is to be found in the decline of the republic, or under the empire, when the civil wars and a general profligacy of manners had demoralized and enslaved all classes of the Roman world. It was not till the reign of Augustus, that these acts of great cruelty reached such a pitch as to call for the interposition of the Senate in the *Lex Petronia.* And even at a period considerably later, when the virtuous Juvenal, who lashed without mercy the public and private vices of his countrymen, would picture an easy, jolly, happy life, he paints the condition of a home-born slave:

> ————Certe modico contentus agebas
> Vernam equitem, conviva joco mordente facetus,
> Et salibus vehemens intra pomœria natis.

The philosophy of this general mildness, in spite of occasional hardships, is not profound. It is all explained by the softening influence and social intercourse of the family relation. Even the worst men, clothed with extensive arbitrary authority, are usually kind and regardful to their immediate domestics and dependents. The contrast between their public displays of monstrosity, and their humane behavior to those of their own households, presents an enigma, a psychological solecism which puzzles the student of history. It is the master of *political* slaves, maintained in irresponsible power by armed force, and standing far apart from the sympathies or the interests of his distant vassals, between whom and himself there can be none of those charities which bind together domestic society—it is such a master, indeed, who riots without a check in human suffering, and finds fresh sport in the widening circle of human woe. A bad ruler, like Nero, or Robespierre, or Lincoln, will wring more agony out of helpless humanity in a brief reign, than all the slaveholders of Rome or the Confederacy would inflict in many generations.

Let us, however, at any rate, accept the actual facts which meet our eyes daily, in reference to the evil now under consideration. We may boldly challenge the nations to compare favorably with us in this regard. Among no laboring population of the world is there so little dispersion of families. You may go out upon many of our plantations, selected at random, in every district of these States, and call around you parents and their descendants to the third and fourth generations, who have never been out of each other's sight for a week in their whole lives. There is a Christian sentiment among us—a point of honor—whose delicacy is growing every day, with respect to the separation of families; and this feeling cannot fail to assume the form and force of a general usage more potent than law.

At the same time we agree, that it would be well for the law to provide against separation in case of sales by executors, administrators, sheriffs, and other trustees. And this for two reasons: first; such sales are the cause of much the larger number of separations; since those trustees will not assume the responsibility of selling families together, without some legal security against the risk of loss. And again; as such sales take place immediately under the authority of the courts—the law being for the time the custodian of the property and standing *in loco domini*—it would be easy, as well as highly proper, to make adequate provisions for the just rights and feelings of all concerned. Nor, we may add, would this be an experiment. The Roman law enacted that, in sales of the kind referred to, slaves, such as husband and wife, parent and child, and even brother and sister, should not be separated.

There are some who seem to speak of the separation of man and wife, under any circumstances, as sinful. This involves the question of divorce, which it is not necessary to argue. It will be decisive, perhaps, with most persons, to invoke the authority of Moses, who expressly commands separation between slaves in certain cases. For our own

part, we are persuaded that it is as much the duty of the master, who is the civil law-giver of his slaves, some times to sunder the marriage relation between those unequally yoked, as it is to encourage and instruct them to form proper connexions. Undoubtedly, he who does so from mere wantonness, or interest, or any motive other than a considerate regard for the highest good of the parties, and that of the rest of his family, incurs a fearful guilt before God. But the guilt is all his own; and it is far better to let him bear it alone, if he will not repent and amend his ways, than, under a morbid tenderness of conscience for the sins of others, to seek relief for him in a scheme that promises only mischief.

Once more: To legalize the marriage of slaves, it is urged, would tend to prevent the crimes of fornication, adultery, and the like, admittedly so notorious amongst them. This effect, it is supposed, would follow, because, in that case, the law must punish such offences between slaves, as it does now between free persons.

Robert Hall has wisely observed, that the criminal indulgence of sensual passions admits but of two modes of prevention: the establishment of such laws and maxims in society as shall render lewd profligacy impracticable or infamous; or the infusion of such principles and habits as shall render it distasteful. Human legislatures, he adds, encounter the disease in the first, the truths and sanctions of religion in the last, of these methods. Now it is manifest that a marriage law will not render the vices referred to either impracticable or infamous among slaves. It will have no tendency that way. They will still mingle together and dwell by themselves as now; the means of gratification will still be as easy and abundant as now; they will still have their own public opinion and standard of propriety as now; and these causes, with others, taken together, will inevitably operate to render the statute for the purpose supposed a dead-letter. You would have to rely almost

exclusively upon themselves for the testimony necessary to conviction. Does any sane man dream the testimony could be had? Is it expected that the master should turn informer? Himself will be a greater sufferer than the slave. Every prosecution, whether followed by conviction or not, must entail some cost, loss, or injury to him; and if the law could possibly be enforced in any tolerable measure up to its numerous violations, (which happily it could not be,) we should all find slaveholding an intolerable burden and annoyance. The slave will return with the chastisement of the court upon him, to the bosom of his own society and associates, to find himself as much respected as he was before, and be jolly together over how much they were making white folks pay for the whistle. Seriously, we do not know any legislation which would more fully realize Walpole's witticism about shearing a hog—great cry and little wool. As things are now, on the other hand, if a master feels it his duty, (and all are deeply guilty who do not feel it their duty,) to restrain these vagrant practices among his slaves, a little reflection will suggest a score of methods, which he may fall upon and vary as occasions demand, far more efficient than any legislation, however stringent. The truth is, the fallacy on this whole subject lies in attributing too much virtue to law, unsupported by public manners—a capital and an incurable error among our modern reformers. Whether it proceed from vanity, or pride of opinion, or lust of power, or honest conviction, each of them, while subordinating moral agencies to a secondary importance, loudly promises that, if he can only get his crotchet embodied in the character of law, mankind may hail a new and glorious era. The event rarely or never answers to the prediction. When the reform mounts the judgment-seat, it suddenly becomes disembodied and evaporates into thin air, which none regard; or, worse still, men open their eyes to find that they have armed with the sword of justice an insupportable petty tyranny.

But we may vindicate the ground upon which we decline to punish slaves by statute law for fornication and the like from another point of view. Human laws deal with the conduct of men as altogether an affair of the present life. They take cognizance of our actions, not as sinful merely, nor as affecting our interests in another state of existence, but as directly and palpably detrimental to the social order and the common weal. Hence the principle on which we do not indict slaves for such offences is, that, when committed by that class among themselves, they are too trivial, insignificant, and remote in their effects upon the general welfare, to demand judicial notice; not but that they are still highly sinful and immoral. Take adultery or bigamy—crimes which our law views, in the superior and governing race, with an eye of severity—they sow the seeds of distrust and jealousy around the hearth-stone, and array family against family; they corrupt the sources of legitimacy, and confound the rights and property of individuals; they transmit animosities, as a legacy, from father to son; and in all their consequences, tend evidently and immediately to overthrow the peace and good order of society. But there is manifestly none, or imperceptibly little of all this in the case of slaves. The reasons are obvious. The most that usually comes of bigamy, for example, among them is a disturbance between the parties immediately concerned, which the authority of the master is perfectly adequate to quell. The evil example does not pass up into and overspread that population, whose virtues or vices give complexion to society and character to government. For the law of caste fixes a great gulf betwixt the two races. Nor, with a vigorous administration of domestic justice on the part of masters, would the evil example be so seriously felt even among the blacks. If men will still declaim upon the sinfulness of African lewdness, as a reason for interposition on the part of the State to suppress it, we can only reply that the common sense of the country must see the solid ground for the distinction here indicated.

Let us now, in confirmation, appeal to the tribunal of practical experience. We do not have to go far for a fit subject. There is the free negro. Legislation of the kind proposed has had unchecked play upon him. The law of marriage extends to him in its full breadth. With what result? He is filthy still—miserably below the average of slave intelligence and morality. Let any man who looks at reforms with a view to practical effects, consider the condition of the free negro, and the reasons for it, and he will be persuaded that a slave marriage law can do no more towards changing the morals of the lustful Ethiopian than towards changing his skin.

What then? Is there no legal remedy for the deplorable sensuality of our Africans? We fear there is none. If the instructions of the pulpit and the sabbath-school—if the salutary influences of church and household discipline fail, we have no hope elsewhere. But they will not fail. They have not failed. The past is full of their trophies. Where, in all human history, do we read of another instance of a people elevated, within so short a period, from such a depth to such a height? What other laboring population would have borne themselves so loyally in the presence of a run-mad crusade, undertaken for their enfranchisement, with every temptation to disobedience and rebellion? And so intimately has this institution identified itself, by its material results, with the wants and happiness of civilized mankind, that if it should fall under the armed assault now making upon it, there must come such distress of nations, with perplexity, as centuries have not witnessed. Indeed, African civilization in America, to the thoughtful student of events, must appear *the* transcendent fact connected with our continent since the discovery of the new world. That fact we owe to the wise neglect of the laws, to the wholesome discipline of fire-side authority, and to the transformative power of everlasting truth. Enough has been accomplished to repay our efforts. The future is hid:

"Shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon it."

We leave its issue with God, invoking His Spirit to inspire us with the knowledge of our obligations as the law-givers, under Him and the State, to these hopeful millions round about us; with faithfulness to discharge these responsibilities as those who must give account to our Master in Heaven; with wisdom to reject the schemes of a daring empiricism; and with resolution to keep steadily in the old paths, which is the good way.

As our object, in reference to the subject-matter contained in the Address, is singular and distinct, we might well close here. We beg, however, to say a word upon two other points.

The real objection to that dead-letter legislation which forbids us to teach our slaves the simplest elements of knowledge, it seems to us, is not stated at all, or at least with any distinctness. It is, that such legislation is an irritating and meddlesome interference on the part of the civil authority, with that salutary house-rule which has been the burden of our discussion. Indeed, here we have a fair illustration of all that we have said. If the State can properly do what she has done in those enactments, suppose she takes it into her head to turn the tables, and require us to send our slaves to school a certain number of months or years; or suppose she should command us how many hours of the day they shall work: what would men think of these propositions? Yet either of them, especially the first, would have better sense to recommend it, than that upon which we are animadverting. We know not in what considerations, or whether in any at all, these statutes against instructing our slaves originated. They are certainly not entitled to the praise accorded by Bacon to the laws of Henry the Seventh, as "not made upon the spur of a particular occasion for the present, but out of providence of the future, to make the estate of the people still more and more happy, after the manner of the legislators in ancient and heroical times." They were absurd from the start, and

are condemned alike by common sense and political economy. They have never been enforced, nor would any community submit to their execution for a moment.

The matter of further provision in our laws, for the protection of the lives and persons of slaves, is well presented in the Address. We venture to offer an additional suggestion. Some of the States, where a slave suffers death for a capital felony, make remuneration to the owner to the extent of half or two-thirds of the slave's value. This is wrong in principle, and works, we believe, as a sort of purchase of the right to kill him. In the administration of public justice, the idea of property should be excluded altogether. *Civiliter*, the slave is property—*criminaliter*, he is a person. In fact the very ground upon which either the State or the master punishes him, in any case, for crime, is that of his distinct moral personality. A pecuniary compensation to the master throws the slave's character as property into the scale against his life, and, we doubt not, often occasions an unevenness of justice. For the master, who is his natural and legal protector, no longer feels the same interest in having him defended. The law should rather, by every proper contrivance, quicken the master's zeal and energy. The slave ought to stand before the court exactly as any other person. We know it is said, on the contrary, that, where this is the case, out of a tender regard for the loss which the unfortunate owner must sustain, juries can hardly be brought to hang a slave at all. And some jurors are weak enough, it must be admitted, to be governed by such considerations. But experience shows, we think, that the weakness is not common; and, at most, it is on the safe side—the side of life and mercy.

ARTICLE III.

RATIONALISM FALSE AND UNREASONABLE.

No one will deny that there is a sphere within which the powers of the mind may be legitimately and profitably employed. During the darker ages of the world, when the intellect was chained by the fetters of priestcraft and trammelled by the bands of superstition, the adventurous thinker might well tremble, lest he should provoke the dreadful anathemas of the Church. But those days have long since gone by. Dungeons do not now frown upon the wildest theorist, or the most heaven-daring sceptic. The mind has been emancipated by the diffusion of a more tolerant spirit; and the restrictions which were imposed upon thought by a more unenlightened age, have all been removed. We may grant that the unbounded freedom which thought now enjoys, has opened the door for the introduction of much that is evil; at the same time, however, we may rejoice that thought is free. Once error could hide itself under the cloak of venerated forms and long-established usages; it could entrench itself behind the authority of names that it were heresy to gainsay or oppose. Now, however, it occupies no vantage ground, as once it did. The arena is open to every contestant. Error must now throw off the mask, come out into the broad daylight, and struggle for its claims with an assailant that stands upon an equal footing with itself.

And besides, one of the glories which crowns the human race, and raises it far above all other forms of earthly being, is the possession of an intellect, active, inquisitive, and aspiring—an intellect which is not content to be the passive recipient of truth, but loves to direct its steps into regions untrodden before, and discover new truths that study and

research alone can reveal. Mental activity is the very condition of our existence—a fundamental and indestructible law impressed upon our nature. Like the waters of the ocean that never rest, the current of thought is always moving.

And the constitution of all things, both without and within us, is such as to incite our minds to constant action. The realm of external nature is spread out before us in one grand and boundless prospect, and invites us to explore its trackless fields. The heavens above our heads are studded with countless orbs of light, that smile upon the astronomer in his investigations of their phenomena and their laws; and the world around us and beneath our feet teems with innumerable objects, which appeal to our love of knowledge, and open a mine of untold wealth to the explorations of the ambitious student. And even in the study of his own incomprehensible nature, man presents an attraction which can occupy the period of a life-time, and command the most intense application of all his faculties. How fearfully and wonderfully is he made! What a subject for the most profound and subtle inquiries that he can institute; consisting, as he does, of a living body in mysterious union with a living soul; invested with a personality which he can not explain; endowed with an intellect so narrow in its compass, and withal so far-reaching in its grasp; a heart so shallow in some of its aspects, and yet so deep in some of its emotions, its passions, and its affections; a will so undetermined and cowardly, yet so determined and brave; a conscience so powerless, and yet so mighty.

From the very constitution of our nature, therefore, as well as from the condition in which we are born, and the circumstances by which we are daily surrounded, we recognise it not merely as a privilege, but also as a duty, to cultivate, develope, and strengthen our various faculties, in the pursuit of truth. If mental activity is a law of our being, and we are placed in a theatre where every thing incites us

to action, we are bound by a moral obligation to educate the intellectual powers which our Creator has given us. We have no right to cast away the crown which has been placed upon our brow, and despise the dignity and honor which God has conferred upon us.

Our researches, however, must not be confined to those subjects which serve only to cultivate the taste, chasten the imagination, enrich the memory, expand the reason, or enlarge the understanding. They constitute a fine intellectual gymnasium, and are, therefore, of fundamental importance in every system of rational education; they adorn the mind with beauty and clothe it with strength; but they have no necessary connexion with our moral improvement; they must, therefore, not absorb our thoughts and engross our time. If restrained within their proper limits, they should be earnestly recommended to all who love knowledge and desire to be cultivated and wise; but they are injurious to our highest interests, when we suffer them to exert an overshadowing influence and monopolize the whole of our energy and activity. We admit that they can justly demand no trifling amount of our time and our study; we concede that they appeal to us with no less a plea than that which the visible creation urges; but after granting that, we affirm that there are other inquiries of a far more pressing kind—inquiries which plead for admission into our serious thoughts with all the earnestness that eternity alone can inspire. While we educate the intellectual, we must not ignore the moral element in the constitution of the soul. It is wrong to dissever what God has associated. It is criminal to feed the mind and starve the heart.

Within us all, there is a conscience. It reveals an inner law, to which it binds our allegiance, and the transgression of which it rebukes with its frowns and avenges with its stings. In connexion with the revelation of this law, there is the revelation of a Moral Governor, whose finger has written it, and whose majesty and authority conspire to

enforce its minutest requirements. Man, therefore, is the subject of a power that is higher than himself. In one sense, he may be the lord of this lower world; but he is not the master of himself, or the arbiter of his destiny. Like the rest of the creation, he belongs to one whose sceptre is universal—to one whose will is sovereign, and binds the heavens and the earth together in one grand, undivided, and indivisible empire.

To this Governor man bears some relation, as is attested by conscience. It becomes, therefore, a matter of the utmost importance for us to determine the exact nature of that relation, as well as to ascertain the various duties which it of necessity involves. We can not afford to tax our minds and weary our brains with the consideration of questions that are speculative, or purely scientific, yet bestow no attention upon those higher questions which make life so solemn and significant. These inquiries gather new significance from the almost universal conviction that the present is but the beginning of an endless existence. The voice that comes up from the great heart of humanity of all ages and countries, falls upon our ears like the noise of many waters, and attests the certainty of a life beyond the grave. Thither we are moving day by day, noiselessly but surely. But even there we shall continue to be under the dominion of Him by whom we are now governed. We shall still sustain to Him the same relation that we now sustain.

But what shall be the nature of that life? Shall the jarring elements of the soul be harmonized? Or shall unruly and discordant passions haunt and deform it there? Shall eternity witness the conflict that this world sees between inclination and duty? Or shall the will then move in cheerful obedience to the directions of conscience? Will the immortal spirit there enjoy a calm repose and an unmixed happiness? Or shall it experience unmitigated misery? Or will our condition there, like our condition

here, be one of mingled pain and pleasure? Questions like the foregoing are of great practical moment. They spring from the fact that man has a conscience and an immortal soul; and they relate to God and the world to come. If other inquiries are useful and obligatory, as we believe them to be, these surely must be of paramount importance. If other inquiries demand our investigation, the claims which these present are far more pressing; for they are connected not only with nature and time, but also with God and eternity.

Subjects of the foregoing kind were not esteemed trifling and insignificant by the wise men of old. Although they were enveloped in the clouds of paganism, some scattering rays of light reached their benighted souls, and enabled them somewhat to appreciate the importance and necessity of religious philosophy. It is true that philosophical speculation and metaphysical science did occupy their laborious researches, and elicit their most patient, thoughtful, and profound investigations; but we must not forget that the science of morals was cultivated as well; and that, not merely with reference to the duties which man owes to his fellow-man, but also with reference to those duties which man owes to God—thereby rising out of the sphere of morals into the higher sphere of natural religion. We do not affirm that either their ethics or their theology was correct in all, or even in the most of its details. That would be claiming too much for even the most gifted and painstaking men, who were educated under the enormities of heathenism, and were obliged to search after truth, obscured by systems of false religion, and buried under a heap of erroneous doctrines and erroneous precepts. It is enough for us to note, that man's relation to the Deity impressed them with a sense of its importance; and that they *endeavored* to answer some of the questions which that relation suggested and presented for solution.

We need not be surprised, therefore, that religious philosophy should commend itself to thinking minds in modern times, when the Scriptures have given such an impetus to human activity in every direction, and have scattered so many of the clouds which once obscured the truths of natural religion. And although this subject may fall more appropriately within the province of the theologian, it is not surprising that it has engaged the thoughts of other minds. Its intrinsic importance, involving as it does matters of vital and eternal interest, recommends it with power to serious thinkers; and the wide range which it offers, in some of its aspects, to the speculations of aspiring and ambitious intellects, insures for it a warm reception at the hands of the philosopher.

Against this, no objection can be legitimately raised. No inquiry is the property of a privileged few; much less one which is so essentially important as that which is made by religious philosophy. So far from opposing, we would welcome the labors of all who honestly endeavor to explain its intricacies and resolve its difficulties. Whatever may be the source, we would hail with grateful pleasure all the light that can be shed upon its dark and perplexing problems. Holding that our relation to God concerns us far more than our relation to nature, and that the duties which it necessitates are superior to all other duties, we would rejoice if any could enlarge the boundary of our knowledge upon topics so worthy of our earnest consideration.

We must regret, however, that so many theologians and philosophers seem well-nigh to ignore the existence of the Bible, and give human reason so exalted a position in the construction of their systems of religious philosophy. Instead of using it as a hand-maid to listen to the Scriptures, they make it mistress and the Scriptures subordinate. It is not strange that ancient sages followed the guidance of reason, and threaded their toilsome way as best they

could, through the labyrinths of error in which they were entangled. We feel a lofty veneration for those poor, benighted spirits, that listened to the whisperings of their hearts, and, under their direction, endeavored to emerge from the oppressive gloom by which they were surrounded. We deeply sympathize with the mighty intellects that struggled so hard to rise above the ignorance of their age, and ascend into the region of unclouded truth; and as we see them toiling with patience to elaborate systems which would bear the test of a universal application, we could almost wish that they had lived to see the splendors of that day whose dawn was then approaching. But instead of veneration, we indulge an unmitigated contempt for the arrogant and presumptuous rationalists of the present day. With all the sad experience of ancient wisdom before them, they discard the instructions of God's blessed word, deny their indebtedness to its inspired pages, and attempt to rush back into the mists that shrouded the minds of the wise men of old.

And of such there are many. The spirit of rationalism is abroad in the world. It has laid its reckless hand upon the temple of orthodoxy, and would drag its pillars to the ground. It has infected the schools of philosophy, and corrupted the purity of theology. It has filled the philosopher with a lofty conceit of his own wisdom, and degraded the Bible in the estimation of the theologian. It has ascended the pulpit, and preached blaspheming nonsense in the house of God. It has stood in the very presence of a crucified Saviour, and poured derision upon his dying love. In the garb of the Gospel, it has denied the very essence of the Gospel. It has seized the public press and scattered its poisonous sentiments in all directions, that it may unsettle the faith of the believer, and plunge the weak and wavering into the depths of a confirmed and hopeless infidelity.

Standing upon the pinnacle of human reason, proud, self-confident man imagines that he can gaze upon the unveiled mysteries of Deity, comprehend all the intricacies of the human spirit, and then construct a religious system which shall be simple in its details, and equal to all the necessities of our nature. The more unintelligent of mortals, (and they have included some of the lights of the world,) have felt themselves unable to evolve such revelations from their consciousness. Burdened by pressing wants, and distracted by forebodings of evil, they have received the Bible as a communication from heaven, and found their burdens removed and their forebodings hushed. They have pressed its precious doctrines to their throbbing bosoms, and found them like the balm of Gilead. They have embraced its matchless truths, and conscience has stopped its accusations; their anxious doubts have all been resolved, their fears quelled, and their tottering feet planted upon a rock as firm as the everlasting hills.

But, alas! it seems they knew not what they were doing. They were all misled by a strange infatuation. They labored under a fearful hallucination. Their fears were groundless, and they were quieted by misapprehensions. Their hopes were the offspring of a disordered brain, and their foretastes of heaven the vapory dreams of besotted enthusiasts. Those great doctrines which they accepted as beyond the discovery of reason, and revealed, philosophy pronounces false and absurd. And philosophy can speak with authority; for it has ascended to those ethereal regions, where all truth, human and divine, shines clear and unclouded in its own pure and beautiful light.

In one form or other, rationalism has long existed in the world. It certainly was not a stranger to the earth in the days of our Saviour. What were the objections of the Sadducees to the doctrine of the resurrection, but objections founded on their inability to reconcile it with some of their sentiments, which they deemed incontrovertible?

And what but the very same spirit pervades Arminianism, Unitarianism, and Universalism, to a greater or less extent?

It was, however, reserved for the last century to develope rationalism as a system, and for the human mind to extend its principles to universal application. Germany, the land of Luther, and the birth-place of the Reformation, has also signalized itself as the cradle of rationalistic infidelity. There the Bible was first unsealed, and its wondrous pages opened to the eyes of the people; and there it has been sealed again, not by the iron hand of Romanism, but by the pretentious wisdom of conceited philosophers and self-inflated theologians. Once the traditions of the Church opposed and concealed the truths of Holy Writ; now, the declarations of the Scriptures are denied and obliterated by the authoritative revelations of human reason. Germany repudiates all allegiance either to the traditions of the Church or to the teachings of the Bible. To Germany, the champions of popery and the defenders of orthodoxy are equally obnoxious. In her judgment, both are enemies to the freedom of impetuous thought, and enslave the mind by confining it to a beaten path. She rejects the historical as an element in the evidences of Christianity, and believes nothing that the soul cannot attest for itself. Her philosophers disdain to search for theological truth outside of themselves. From the depths of their own consciousness they can construct a system of religion which shall rival Christianity in simplicity, in beauty, in truthfulness, and in power. With them, the light within is so bright that they need no illumination from without.

Nay, the communications of reason are so transcendent in clearness, that they can expunge all errors from that which professes to be an external revelation, and leave behind the unadulterated truth. They comprehend the nature of Deity so thoroughly, that they can correct the caricature which the Bible gives of God. The triune Jehovah is not the living God, but the invention of a more

ignorant age—an absurdity incredible to a rational man. The atonement of Christ, in our eyes the corner-stone of Christianity, is pronounced a falsehood too monstrous to be believed; and future punishment, a relic of credulous antiquity. The essence of rationalism consists in exalting human reason to the dignity of supreme judge in all questions of a theological kind. It erects a tribunal within the precincts of the soul, and clothes it with unlimited power to test the truthfulness or falsity of any supposed revelation; and the only law by which it renders an infallible verdict, is a system of religious philosophy which man has constructed for himself. The tenets of a speculative philosophy are applied to the criticism of the Bible; and every doctrine is discarded, unless it can be reconciled to the imperious requirements of the system which reason has elaborated.

The rationalist is confident of the justness of his pretensions—so confident, that his vengeance is as cool and deliberate as it is remorseless and insatiable. He is not afraid to reject the most sacred and touching doctrines of the Scriptures, if they are unable to endure the ordeal of fire to which they are subjected. The doctrine may be invested with the most hallowed associations, and for centuries it may have been enshrined in the warmest affections of the excellent of the earth: he cares not for that; there is no soul in his philosophy; he is clothed with the majesty of the ermine, and even the Son of God himself must stand before the judgment-seat upon which he sits.

Rationalism, therefore, contains the germ of the most audacious infidelity, and is one of the deadliest and most dangerous enemies with which the Bible has to contend. In its incipient stage, we may not regard it with much apprehension. In some of its aspects, it does not reveal the results which it involves. In some of its advocates, it exhibits only a partial denial of the authority of Holy Writ, and continues to retain the most important features of orthodox theology. Yet even then, the principle that

animates it is at war with God's word; and when carried to its legitimate length, as it has been by many, it saps the foundation on which revelation rests, and leaves us no light but that which the glimmering lamp of reason gives, and no guide but that which a darkened understanding supplies.

Many devout and God-fearing men would shrink from the consequences to which rationalism logically leads them. But how can they rebut the charge of battling in the ranks of infidelity, while adhering to the sentiments which they avow and maintain? If reason is the pillar and ground of a single revealed doctrine, why may it not be the judge of all revealed doctrines? And if any concede that reason may lawfully remove one stone from the sacred building, why may not others, more sacrilegious than they, destroy the whole edifice of divine truth? To admit its claims at all, is to furnish the enemies of Christianity with a dangerous weapon.

It is sad to see that, as soon as one javelin is wrested from the hands of infidelity, it seizes another and hurls it in defiance at the heart of Christianity. One wave no sooner recoils from the rock of God's word, broken and shattered, than another rolls on. We feel no apprehensions for the safety of revelation; we are certain that it will always withstand the fiercest assaults of its bitter foes, and achieve new triumphs among generations yet unborn, and regions yet uncivilized; but it is painful to see that the enemies of the truth are still undismayed, and that they nerve themselves for the struggle, although they have been so often and so signally defeated.

Rationalism will no doubt have its day, and hereafter be numbered with the exploded follies of the past. Now, however, it rages like a rampant lion, standing ready to devour his prey. Like Goliath of Gath, it is armed with sword and spear and buckler, and comes forth to defy the armies of the living God. It has crossed the German ocean, and planted its feet upon British soil. After doing

its work of death on the continent of Europe, its bloody sword thirsts for victims in other quarters. Oxford, the seat of tractarianism, has reared an altar to its praise; and the sober mind of practical old England has been infected by its foul and corrupting breath. It has even ventured across the broad Atlantic, and raised its ensign upon the shores of the Northern States. In both the eastern and the western worlds, it numbers many names among its admirers and its advocates; and before its race shall have been run, it may number many more. But why does rationalism flaunt its banner so defiantly in the very face of inspiration? Is it merit, or impudence, that gives it such boldness? What valid plea does it urge in attempting to rob us of the Bible, and supplant it by a revelation which is written upon the soul? What weighty arguments does it employ while endeavoring to destroy the God of the Scriptures, and substitute a divinity that reason has disclosed? These questions mankind have a right to ask of a system with pretensions so flaming; and they must be answered, before the claims of the Bible can lose their power.

Pride, the love of novelty, and carnal opposition to humiliating facts, may gather many votaries around the shrine of rationalism. Unwilling to worship God, many may be willing to worship themselves. Dethroning Jehovah, they may enthrone reason, and bow before its altar as enthusiastic devotees. All this we can understand from our knowledge of the total depravity of the human heart; all this we can explain without abating one jot from the authority of inspiration.

Rationalism, therefore, must not expect us to yield to its demands upon the mere proclamation of its infallibility. When it raises its presumptuous head, and, like the Chaldean king of old, bids us bend the knee before its golden image, we are compelled to refuse, until our scruples can be satisfied and our objections removed. As rational beings we are bound to canvass its claims; and in doing that, we

meet with objections of so grave a character, that they destroy our faith in the whole system, and evince it to be the offspring of earth, and not the child of heaven.

I. It denies the possibility of every external revelation. Infidelity of the old deistical school repudiated the divine origin of the Scriptures. It contended that the necessities of mankind did not require the interposition of a supernatural communication; but it did not maintain that such a communication was impossible. It rejected the inspiration of the Bible; but it did not deny that God might reveal his will to mortals. Rationalism, however, is more comprehensive in its creed, and has advanced in the demands which it makes upon our faith. In one sweeping charge, it virtually condemns every book that may profess to have originated from the Ruler of the world. It requires us to believe, not merely that the claims of the Bible are spurious, but also that God can never reveal one single truth that lies beyond the discovery of human reason. The supposed revelation may be based upon such an amount of historical evidence as cannot be brought to substantiate the authenticity of any volume now extant, or the genuineness of any document that has been preserved from antiquity; it may be supported by the concurrent testimony of many intelligent witnesses, who depose that they saw the wonderful occurrences which they narrate, and heard the gracious words which they record; who write as if they were men of integrity, and could have no possible motive for practising an imposition; who are willing to encounter the scorn and derision which their doctrines provoke, and are ready to offer their lives as seals of their credibility; it may contain the prediction of future events, and after the lapse of years and centuries, these prophecies may be verified by the voice of history: yet notwithstanding all, philosophy will dispute its claims and oppose them bitterly to the end.

In affirming this, we do not misrepresent rationalism in the least. The fundamental postulate which it requires us to concede, justifies the strong assertions that we have made. The system is grounded on the proposition, that reason is unerring in its judgments, certain in its apprehensions, and infallible in its dicta; and this proposition implies that man can receive no new communication from without, and no external elucidation of any revelation within. For in both the one case and the other, the soul would not be the fountain of its own religious knowledge, as the rationalist contends that it is.

As a further corroboration of the truthfulness of what we have asserted, we may quote some of the language which eminent rationalists have used. Kant and Fichte both maintain "that no doctrine can be received on the authority of revelation, without the concurrent testimony of reason." Hegel affirms that "man has knowledge of God only in so far as God has knowledge of himself; this knowledge is God's self-consciousness; but just so is it, too, his knowledge of man; and God's knowledge of man is man's knowledge of God." Mr. Newman regards the soul as "the organ of specific information to us," respecting things spiritual; and Mr. Parker says "that there is a connexion between God and the soul, as between light and the eye, sound and the ear, food and the palate."

These quotations all bear us out in the assertion which we have already proven, that the philosophy of the rationalist denies the possibility of any supernatural communication from God to man.

Can such a position be successfully maintained? Is this rampart, behind which the new religion places itself, impregnable?

To many, the bare statement of the proposition which rationalists affirm and their system involves, would carry the undoubted conviction that its claims are unfounded. What! Require him to believe that his own narrow nature

is the storehouse of all knowledge, both human and divine?—ask him to concede that reason supplies all truth, both for faith and for practice, and excludes the idea of assistance from without? When one demands the assent of mankind to an article of faith like the foregoing, the great majority of men will refuse to yield it. They can not believe a proposition which is opposed, not merely by the sentiments that they have imbibed from education and from the early teachings of religious parents, but also by the very deepest feelings of their souls. They have often consulted the oracle within, and found it unequal to the necessities of their case. In numerous instances, it has given no response to the questions which they have propounded; and even when answers have been given, they have frequently been uncertain and unsatisfactory. Their experience, therefore, is at variance with that of the rationalist. The stand-point which they occupy, is one of conscious weakness and deplorable ignorance; and their sense of dependence compels them to believe that the all-wise God is able to enlighten them. They are so thoroughly grounded in such a conviction, that they would hardly tolerate a man who would come out boldly and advocate an opposite theory. No argument, however plausible, could be so artfully constructed, or so skilfully presented, as to drive them from sentiments which their helplessness and blindness have forced them to adopt.

We are aware that a caviller may object to the validity of an inference drawn from such considerations as the preceding. He may endeavor to break their force, on the ground that they are urged by those who have been taught from infancy to receive the Bible as an inspired volume. He may deny that such persons can be legitimately cited as witnesses, because all their prejudices are in favor of revelation. He may charge the Scriptures with having given an unnatural coloring to all the forms of their thoughts and feelings, and affirm that the false system of education

under which they have grown up, has obscured and even obliterated the intuitions of their reason.

We might retort by reminding him that all his prejudices are against the Bible; and if others are incompetent to bear witness in favor of the necessity and possibility of a revelation, because they have been corrupted by the instructions of their earlier years, he is not a competent witness against the truthfulness of a supposed revelation, because his religious susceptibilities and perceptions have been clouded and blunted by his infidelity. We might also express surprise that a book which has given such healthy impetus to human thought in every other direction, should mislead the mind in its search after religious truth.

But we will do more. We will point him to the more fortunate of mankind, who have escaped the baneful influence which Christianity has exerted. Let him glance for a moment at the systems of religion, which either have prevailed or do now prevail, beyond the range of the Bible's dominion; and let him say, if a belief in the possibility of a revelation is not an idea that pervades them all, though they may be never so diverse in their minuter details.

If the historical statements of the Scriptures are worthy of any credit, we know that the idolatry of the Canaanites and the paganism of the Babylonians and other contemporaneous nations, not only admitted the possibility of external revelations, but maintained that they had frequently been given by the national deities. They had their priests and their prophets, who were expected not only to attend to the ordinances of their worship, but also to interpret the communications of the gods. Roman mythology records the existence of the same belief among the inhabitants of the imperial city. How else can we explain the myth of the mysterious Sibyl that is enfolded in the mists of early Roman history? What were those sacred leaves but exponents of the wide-spread sentiment that the higher powers could reveal their will to the sons of earth? And the

prognostications of events, which were gathered by augurs and soothsayers from the entrails of beasts, the flight of birds, and the supernatural articulations of brutes—what were they, in the estimation of the pagan devotee, but the chosen language that was used by the gods to communicate with men, and make known their counsels to their faithful worshippers?

And what shall we say of the Delphian oracle, which was renowned over the civilized world, and consulted not by Greeks alone, but by Roman senators and by foreign princes—aye, and by Socrates himself, one of the purest, most profound, and most practical of all the ancient philosophers? In the eyes of antiquity, the Pythian priestess was the fountain of a more than human wisdom, and the foot of Mount Parnassus a consecrated spot, where pilgrims from every land might gather and consult the powers above, through their inspired mouthpiece.

Mohammedanism breathes a similar spirit, and embodies the very same idea. A belief in the possibility of an external revelation is so deeply imbedded in the structure of the human soul, that Mohammed was compelled to recognise it, and engraft it upon the religious system which he originated. When he conceived the idea of duping mankind, by constructing a religion that should secure for its author the veneration of its votaries, he could only mature it by retiring into solitude and pretending to communicate with heaven through the interposition of an angel. And while the sword was to be employed in proselyting the nations, the founder of the Islam faith deemed it necessary to the success of his ambitious designs, to urge his claims by appealing to God for the seal of his authority.

When we turn our eyes to the millions of India and China, who are yet bound by the superstitions which chained their ancestors, they unite their testimony with that of the mighty dead.

Mormonism furnishes no exception to what we have thus far discovered. The author of the Mormon Bible, as dishonest as he was designing, professed to have found it traced upon the metal plates in mysterious characters, which were interpreted by an angel. And the prophet that has succeeded him, claims that, from time to time, he is receiving new intimations of the divine will.

When we leave the civilized nations, and examine the religious belief of the uncivilized and the barbarous, who are without a written language, we note the same idea in the superstitions by which they are characterized. If we analyze their signs and their omens, they resolve themselves most naturally into symbols which the gods have selected, in order to give instruction to ignorant mortals.

From this cursory view of the past and the present, we discover one common sentiment embodied in the religious creeds of the human race. However much they may differ in the number or character of the deities that are worshipped, they are unanimous in contradicting the fundamental proposition of rationalism. The united voice of all ages and countries; the concurrent testimony of the civilized and the uncivilized; of the heathen, the Mohammedan, the Mormon, and the Christian; condemns the views which the rationalist has adopted—views upon the truthfulness of which he rests the claims of his system. The judgments of the world do not agree as to those volumes which are inspired and authoritative, and those which are not; but they do agree in affirming that the idea upon which the Bible is constructed, is not peculiar to Christianity, but common to all religions: they maintain that external revelations can be made.

Now, how shall we account for a sentiment so widespread? How did it originate and become universal? Are all men deceived? Have all ages recorded a falsehood? Shall we acknowledge that mankind has been blinded until now, and that philosophy enjoys the prerogative of correct-

ing so grave an error? Or shall we argue that philosophy is presumptuous, when it demands our assent to a proposition which is so extensively denied? No rational mind can hesitate in giving an answer. The opinion of the race, in all its varied conditions, and during all the various periods of its existence, is one; it therefore bears the stamp of a primitive truth; and we must accept IT, and not the dogma of the rationalist, as the voice of God in the soul of man. We are compelled by all the laws of belief to receive it as an intuitive truth, when it comes to us supported by the testimony of all ages, countries, and creeds; and, as an intuitive truth, we plant ourselves firmly upon it and rest in safety there. Rationalism can never dislodge us. It may stultify itself; but it can never persuade an honest and well balanced mind that it is right, when confronted and contradicted by such a mass of overwhelming evidence. The sanction of learned names and erudite authority may mislead some; but the great body of mankind will believe in the intuitions of the many, instead of the vagaries of the few.

But further: If God can reveal no truth which reason cannot confirm, man can communicate to his fellow man no fact which he can not substantiate for himself.

Rationalism certainly maintains that the human mind is the ultimate standard of appeal in all questions of a theological kind; and that no doctrine can ever be binding, unless approved by it and sanctioned by its authority. But how can the principle which such an assertion contains, be restricted in its application? Why should it be confined to religious matters alone? If no testimony in behalf of the supernatural is entitled to credit, may we not rightly infer that testimony is never credible? Rationalism denies the veracity of men who profess to have been inspired, and thereby qualified to teach us truth which is undiscoverable by man; at the same time, however, it would raise no objections against their truthfulness, if they were

ordinary historians. Why does it make such a distinction? If it is lawful, nay, necessary to discard evidence in the one case, why may it not be rejected in all cases? A plain man can not understand why a witness who is trustworthy, when deposing to one fact, should be unworthy of credit when deposing to another. We are accustomed to test the validity of testimony by inquiring into the character of the witness; and when that has been established, we no longer question the trustworthiness of his depositions. We cannot, therefore, see why a man who is acknowledged to be honest, upright, and truthful, when testifying to the natural, is disbelieved when testifying to the supernatural. Philosophy may perceive a difference between the two cases, and may therefore feel justified in the conclusion which it has reached. But it must pardon less acute intellects, if they cannot see how objections against evidence in favor of the supernatural fail to be objections against evidence in general. If Moses and Paul are not to be believed, because they tell of things that lie beyond the possibility of discovery as well as comprehension, why should we believe them if they should testify to facts of a historical nature?

If, therefore, as rationalism affirms, no evidence can substantiate any theological doctrine that lies beyond the range of human reason, we contend that no evidence can prove the occurrence of a single event that has happened beyond the pale of our personal experience. And thus the world must sink, not into the depths of religious scepticism alone, but into the dark abyss of universal unbelief.

The statements of our most cherished and valued friends must be regarded with distrust, unless they can be confirmed by observations of our own. One generation may not learn wisdom by the experience of the past, for it can never know what that experience was. The principles of sound statesmanship must be confined to the age in which they originated, nay, within a smaller compass than even that. Neither virtue nor vice can be transmitted, except through the in-

fluence which they exerted on those with whom they came immediately in contact. Historians are toiling in vain, when they spend days and months over the records of the past, in order that they may separate the true from the false, and guard their volumes against the introduction of errors; for they can verify nothing that they narrate; and even if they could, any reader might disbelieve every sentence that they had written. Courts of justice are empty formalities; you can never be certain that you have a true copy of the laws that were enacted by the proper authorities; but even if that difficulty were surmounted, your witnesses might be dishonest and corrupt; and although every precaution had been taken to secure men of reputable and upright character, they might swear to a falsehood, while protesting that it was the truth.

Are we willing to adopt a proposition which leads to consequences like the foregoing? Even should we denounce the authority of the Bible, could we accept so dreary a system, which throws a cloud of uncertainty over the whole history of the past, and obscures all the present, excepting that limited portion which falls within the circle of our own contracted vision? Common sense asserts its right to be heard, when rationalism with reckless hand would sweep away the credibility of all testimony; and the verdict of common sense will condemn the dictum of a hair-brained, speculative philosophy.

The rationalist may seek to evade the force of the foregoing objection to his system, by replying that, in the nature of things, religious truth appeals to the reason for confirmation or rejection, while the knowledge of the past just as naturally depends upon well-accredited testimony; he may therefore contend, that he is obeying the laws of his constitution, when he admits the validity of evidence in support of the historical, and denies it in support of the supernatural.

To this we make two rejoinders:

1. He should remember that the position which he assigns to reason in matters of religion is controverted, and that not by a few, but by the great majority of mankind. Until, therefore, he can demonstrate that reason is really invested with the functions which he ascribes to it, he must not assume that it is, in order to disprove the objections which are raised against that very feature of his system. To do so is to beg the very question at issue, and thereby render himself unassailable by any arguments, even the most weighty.

2. If rationalism admits that facts of history may be substantiated by testimony, as it must do in attempting to defend itself against the charge of universal scepticism, we may easily prove that it involves itself in contradictions from which it cannot escape.

Every man that rejects the scheme of Pantheism, and believes in a personal God who is independent of nature, and is the great First-Cause of all things, perceives at a glance, that there are many facts connected with the universe, of as purely a historical character as any of the events which have happened under the observation of different generations—facts which it is impossible for reason ever to discover, because they are historical. For example: If God is the Creator of the universe, there certainly was a time when the work was completed. Unless all things were made at once, there was some special order in the successive acts of creating power; there was a time when the earth was first ready for the reception of those who were to inhabit its surface, and man came forth from the hands of his Maker, endowed with such faculties as infinite Wisdom saw fit to give him.

Now, unless God has less power than His creatures, (which it were profane and impious to assert,) we must acknowledge that He is able to communicate a knowledge of these things to any that He may select for the purpose. Unless Omnipotence is weaker than its handy-work, we are com-

pelled to admit that God can inform man when the world was made; what order He observed in the different departments of creation; and what was the nature of all things, when each one was finished and assigned to its proper place. To this, rationalism can oppose no objection, as long as it assents to a belief in the credibility of history. It must acknowledge that God can as well reveal those facts to man, as one man can communicate historical facts to another; and since it does not dispute the trustworthiness of all testimony, it must also grant that, in case God should see fit to make such a revelation, a witness would be as capable of testifying to the reality of that revelation, and as trustworthy in his statements, as when he affirms his knowledge of an ordinary event that has occurred before his own eyes.

If, therefore, we have a volume that professes to have been dictated by Jehovah, in order to inform us on topics so far beyond the discoveries of reason, yet lying within the province of history, rationalism must concede, that the claims of such a volume are entitled to be weighed, and that the evidence which supports them demands as fair and impartial an examination as that which is allowed to historical evidence in general.

We have such a volume—a book that professes to give a historical account of the creation, and a true record of God's first transaction with His creatures—a book, all the distinctive theology of which is based upon the supposition, that it furnishes us with a correct narrative of man's primitive estate of innocence and purity, and his subsequent lapse into sin and guilt. After many centuries, we have another volume, which professes to give us a sketch of the most remarkable personage that ever lived. Many strange and wonderful deeds are said to have been done by him; many remarkable words are said to have fallen from his lips; but most wonderful of all, it is said that, after having been buried for three days, he rose from the dead. Many witnesses affirm that they saw him after his resurrection, and

recognised him as the same Jesus that they had followed as his disciples.

All these are historical facts; and as facts, they may be confirmed by proper evidence, according to the admission of rationalists themselves. Yet rationalism denies many, if not all of them; and why? Not because there is a deficiency in the number of the witnesses; not because any thing can be alleged against their character, or their motives; but because the subject-matter of the narrative forms the groundwork of a theological system which human reason cannot approve.

See then, the contradiction in which rationalism is involved. The only way in which it could hope to vindicate itself from the charge of universal scepticism, was to admit the validity of testimony in behalf of the historical. And since there is a historical element which constitutes the basis of evangelical theology, rationalism, if true to its admissions, would be forced to acknowledge that it may be the proper subject of competent testimony. But to admit that, would be to discard its own theology; and in order that *it* may be preserved, the rationalist denies the truthfulness of historical evidence, and thereby not only contradicts his former statements, but also confirms us in what we proved before: he makes the whole past a perfect blank, and blots out all of the present that does not fall within our limited observation and experience.

Again: If we are bound to reject every religious doctrine that reason can not attest, we must also disbelieve all scientific facts which we are unable to substantiate for ourselves.

The theology of the rationalist embraces all the intuitive perceptions of the reason in matters of religion, together with all the consequences that are logically deducible from them. All these he will include among the articles of his faith; but no amount of evidence will induce him to go farther. They form the platform on which he stands; and he would not consent either to enlarge or to diminish it in

one single particular, even though a voice from heaven should seem to tell him that he was wrong.

Now, if such views are correct, when applied to religious philosophy, they must also apply, with equal correctness, to every science that is composed of intuitive principles and their legitimate consequences; and not merely to such a science, but to all sciences which are made up of facts established by observation, together with their logical sequences. If an external revelation insults the reason by offering to supplement its ignorance with light from heaven, the understanding is equally insulted when required to receive a scientific truth which it either does not perceive at a glance, or can not deduce from premises that are either axioms or the results of observation. There is a perfect analogy between the two cases; and whatever holds true of the one must also hold true of the other. If religious doctrines should be rejected, unless confirmed by consciousness, or by inferences drawn from the facts of consciousness; scientific truths must in like manner be denied, unless proved by observation, or by investigations founded on observation.

Are we prepared to place our knowledge of science upon such a basis, and accept all the results that follow from such an admission? Let us see the consequences to which it leads. There are many truths which chemists have announced as the discoveries of long-continued and laborious experiments. Few have the time, and still fewer the means, to make the investigations for themselves. Shall we therefore discredit the statements that are made by eminent men, and be sceptical in regard to the facts of chemistry, because we are not able to substantiate them for ourselves? Many of the laws of mechanical philosophy may be mathematically demonstrated, but most men are unable to prove them. Shall they hesitate on that account to receive them as scientific truths? The laws of Kepler may be understood and appreciated by a schoolboy; but situated as he

is, he cannot verify them. Shall he deny that they are the laws which govern the motions of the heavenly bodies, until higher attainments and personal observation enable him to establish them as such? Astronomers can predict with unerring certainty the eclipses of the sun and the moon for ages to come. Shall we refuse to believe their calculations, because our knowledge is more limited than theirs?

To all these questions we are bound to render a negative answer. We plainly perceive, that the necessities of our circumstances compel us to accept many scientific truths on the testimony of others, while better opportunities and more thorough scholarship would enable us to determine them for ourselves. Thus it has ever been, and thus it will ever be. So far therefore from stultifying ourselves in doing as we do, we follow the only course that befits a rational mind; and since rationalism, when rightly interpreted, enjoins an opposite course, we urge this as a third objection against a system so presumptuous in its assertions and so pernicious in its influence.

Lastly: If an external revelation is impossible, it can only be so because the internal revelation is complete and infallible. It must be both: for if it was incomplete, it might receive additions; and if it was fallible, it might be corrected. But this is not all. Since every mind is a judge for itself, the system of religious philosophy which each man constructs for himself must be complete and infallible. Behold then, the proposition to which rationalism bids us assent! We can never consent to adopt it. If the theology which reason reveals is complete, why do the systems of some of its advocates embrace so much more than those of some others? And if all are infallible, why do they present so many contradictions? One rationalist rejects the authority of one of the sacred books, while another admits it. Both must be infallible, or rationalism is a falsehood; and yet they cannot be infallible, for they contradict each

other. Mr. Emerson is a Pantheist, and Mr. Parker a Spiritualist. Both are right, for both are infallible; yet both cannot be right, for their respective systems are contradictory.

How can we embrace a system when it involves such absurdities? The incomprehensible we may believe, but the absurd never; and to make such a demand is to insult our common sense, and to ignore all the laws of human belief.

From the several considerations already presented, we are compelled to deny the fundamental assumption of rationalistic theology. If the independent conclusions of the human mind are the criteria that test the validity of a supposed revelation, they virtually exclude the possibility of any revelation at all; and if a revelation is impossible, we must condemn the judgments of all ages and countries; renounce our faith in the credibility of all historical evidence; reject all scientific truths that we are unable to demonstrate for ourselves; and acknowledge that the various antagonistic schemes of religious philosophy are all complete and infallible, and claim our acceptance with equal and irresistible power.

But we feel that a primitive truth has authority which we dare not resist; we shrink from a cheerless scepticism which consigns the past to oblivion, and the present to uncertainty; we are forced by the necessities of our condition, as well as by the example of profound and erudite scholars, to accept the discoveries of science, although we cannot verify them by investigations of our own; and by an unchangeable law of our nature, we are constrained to reject every proposition that involves an absurdity. We are justified therefore, in strenuously opposing the claims of rationalism; in denouncing it as vain, presumptuous, arrogant and pretentious; and in pronouncing it utterly unreasonable in the demands which it makes upon our faith.

And here we might stop. For if metaphysical theology is absolutely dependent upon the denial of the possibility

of an external revelation, as we have shown that it is; and if that denial involves us in perplexities and absurdities from which we cannot escape, as we have proved that it does; then we have no alternative but to charge the whole system of rationalism with waging war upon the constitution of our nature, and therefore with being false in theory, irrational, and unworthy of our reception.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

ARTICLE IV.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF THE COLORED PEOPLE.*

The Committee to whom was referred the subject of providing more thorough religious instruction for the colored people within the bounds of Harmony Presbytery, respectfully report, that they have given the subject their most earnest consideration, and would embody the results of their inquiries and reflections in the following statements and recommendations.

The Committee do not deem it necessary to offer any extended or elaborate argument, to show that it is the solemn duty of the Church to make ample provision for the religious instruction of such of this race as have been cast upon her care by the providence of God. This duty, it is believed, will readily be conceded by every enlightened Christian community in the land. No other rational solution can possibly be given of that singular providence which

* Presented to Harmony Presbytery, October, 1863.

brought them to our shores, and we shall be sadly remiss in our duties both to the great Head of the Church and to our fellow man, if we do not avail ourselves of this favorable turn of providence to promote His glory and secure their everlasting salvation. Nor can we satisfy our own consciences for holding them in bondage, or exacting from them the daily services we do, if we do not make some kind of compensation in the bestowment of spiritual blessings. We freely acknowledge our obligation to provide for their temporal wants; and the master who fails to do this, is not only chargeable with unkindness and injustice to his slaves, but is sure to incur the deserved censure of his fellow-men. But are we under less obligation to provide for their spiritual improvement? If a sense of duty, interest, or regard to the sentiments of our fellow-men, compels us to the performance of one class of these duties, why should a sense of justice and accountability to God not compel us to the observance of the other? But more than this. Our servants constitute a part of our households. It is only on this ground that we can find any sanction in the word of God for the institution of slavery. As members of the family-compact, they have therefore the same claims for religious instruction that our children have; and the neglect of duty in one case, is scarcely less reprehensible than in the other. Our people generally admit the justice of these claims; and the great body of them would long since have entered more heartily upon the discharge of this duty, if they had not been embarrassed by the officious intermeddling of northern Abolitionists. This source of embarrassment, it is hoped, will not exist hereafter, and one of the great ends of the bloody conflict in which we are now engaged will be entirely frustrated, if it does not result in the spiritual amelioration of our black people.

The Committee are glad to believe that the number of those among us, who look upon the religious instruction of the negroes with suspicion and apprehension, is constantly diminishing. The assumption that the stability of the in-

stitution is thereby imperilled, or the safety of the whites jeoparded, is not only contrary to reason and experience, but is exceedingly dishonoring to the Gospel of Jesus Christ itself. That Gospel, if it exerts any influence upon the hearts of men at all, promotes peace, harmony, subordination to authority, and whatever else is necessary to the peace and welfare of society. Besides which, it is simply absurd in men to go to the Bible to find a sanction for the institution of slavery, and yet be unwilling for the minds of their slaves to be imbued with its teachings on this and all other subjects of practical importance. If our colored people thoroughly understood, from their own personal knowledge of the Scriptures, just what they teach in relation to the mutual duties of master and servants, there is reason to believe that they would be happier, more contented in their lot, and would be far more faithful and cheerful in the performance of their duties. There is one aspect of this matter which your Committee could wish was impressed upon the heart of this whole country. A bitter and unreasonable prejudice exists against this institution in almost every other portion of the civilized world; and this, no doubt, is the main reason why no helping hand has hitherto been stretched out to aid us in the unequal contest in which we are engaged. So far as our Northern enemies are concerned, this prejudice does not lie so much against the institution of slavery as such, as against the blacks as a race. The natural antipathy of the Northener to the negro, as the world is beginning to find out, is most intense, and some of the Northern journals have had the honesty of late to acknowledge that the great end of the war they are waging against us is to sweep away the black population to make room for the whites; that they are fighting the whites of the South because they serve as a bulwark to defend the blacks. Now, it is a matter of the greatest importance that our black people should have intelligence enough to comprehend this state of things.

They ought to be sufficiently intelligent, not only to understand what is the precise relationship authorized by the word of God between them and their masters, but what would be their ultimate condition, if we were to be borne down by the great odds arrayed against us—that we are resisting with all the energy God has given, a prejudice that is more injurious to them than ourselves; and that our overthrow would be their ruin. If these things were thoroughly understood by them, which cannot be the case without a higher degree of intelligence than they possess at present, they would not only be happier in their condition as servants, but in case of any future struggle for national existence, like the one through which we are now passing, instead of being a weakness, they would be a source of the greatest strength.

Your Committee are glad to learn, upon inquiry, that most, if not all, of the ministerial members of this Presbytery are, and have been, for a number of years past, actively engaged in promoting the spiritual welfare of the colored people of their respective charges. In most of our congregations, a separate service is held for the blacks every Sabbath, consisting of singing, prayer, reading the scriptures, and a sermon or catechetical instruction, or the two combined. These services, whenever regularly maintained, are highly valued by the blacks, as may be inferred from the numbers who attend them; and their good effects upon their moral and religious character will not be doubted by any one who has had opportunity to note their general deportment, or who believes in the power of the Gospel to reform the hearts and lives of men. Your Committee would not, therefore, recommend any modification or suspension of these labors, upon which God has placed the broad seal of his approbation, but they would supplement and enlarge them, by enlisting the services of the great body of Christian members in the same good work;

and to this end, they would recommend the following measures:

1. That it should be the aim of every Christian master in our Church to have his negroes attend the same place of religious worship with himself. It is not only his duty to have them instructed in the principles of the Gospel, but it should be done as much as possible under his own personal inspection. He expects his children to attend the same ministrations with himself, and it is not less his duty to see that his negroes attend the same place of worship. Of course no harsh or arbitrary measures should be employed to effect this object, but a little care and persuasion on the part of the master, it is believed, would easily secure the desirable end. The license to attend any place of worship they may choose, may not only leave them without any solid religious knowledge, but it often begets habits of the most objectionable character. The practice of employing ministers of other denominations to visit our plantations and hold stated religious meetings for our black people, is very objectionable. Our own Church should devise plans for the full and thorough instruction of all classes among us, and we ought not, therefore, to invoke the aid of other denominations to do for us what we ought to do for ourselves.

2. Your Committee would recommend again that a small chapel be erected on every plantation, where the black people may be assembled every Sabbath afternoon for religious worship, and where they may be taught hymns, portions of Scripture, and receive catechetical instruction. These services should be conducted by the master of the plantation, or some other member of the white family, or by all the members of the family capable of instructing, united. The pastor of the church should visit all these plantations in the bounds of his congregation in rotation, for the purpose of giving advice and speaking a word of encouragement to those who are en-

gaged in teaching, as well as those who are taught. It would be well also for a uniform system of instruction to be adopted in all the plantation schools of the same congregation, so that once a month, or once in three months, the pastor might examine the whole of the black congregation at the church, in relation to what they had been learning in the intermediate time. The particular hymn or hymns to be learned, the portions of Scripture to be committed to memory, and the catechetical instruction to be imparted, should be announced from the pulpit on each of the general review days. It is not only important that the minds of our colored people should be stored with this kind of knowledge, but great advantages will arise from their learning the same lessons at the same time. In this way, they would be able to unite in singing the same hymns in public worship; converse with each other on their way to and from the church, in relation to what they had been taught; and the pastor of the church would do well to make the passage of Scripture given as a lesson the subject of discourse for the intervening Sabbaths. A similar course of instruction might be adopted where our congregations are confined to towns and villages, the particulars of which the Committee need not detail. Your Committee confidently believe that if this course of instruction were systematically and efficiently carried out, it would, with the blessing of Almighty God, not only inaugurate a new and happier period in the spiritual condition of our colored people, but would impart new energy and life to our whole church, by calling into exercise all the graces and talents committed to us as a people.

3. A third measure which your Committee would recommend, is the assembling of the negroes of the plantation once a day, in the morning or evening, as might be found most convenient, in the chapel, or some other convenient room, for daily prayers. The exercises might consist of singing a hymn and prayer, or reading a portion of

Scripture and prayer, and should not be extended beyond twelve or fifteen minutes. The exercises should be conducted by some member of the white family, or where there was a suitable black man on the place, they might be conducted in part or whole by him. The time fixed for these prayers should be in the morning, when the people were on their way to work, or at night, when they were returning from their labors. On most of our plantations this would be a novel measure, and, at first, some difficulty no doubt would be encountered in enforcing it; but a little of that patience and perseverance which we claim as a denomination, would guarantee success; and your Committee firmly believe that it would, after a while, be productive of the happiest results to every plantation where it is perseveringly carried out.

4. A further recommendation is, that the domestic servants of every household should be required to attend morning and evening prayers with the white family, and the exercises should be modified as much as possible to suit their circumstances. It is greatly to be regretted that this important and obvious duty is overlooked in so many of our Christian families. As a general thing, we are scrupulous and conscientious in requiring this duty of our children; and why should we be less so in requiring it of our domestic servants? If they are permitted to loiter about the premises while these solemn and interesting exercises are going on in the white family, it will naturally beget in their minds the conviction that they have no lot or part in this great matter; and it may be worse for them in the great day of accounts than it would be if they had never known such privileges. It is not surprising that they should be indifferent, or even averse to attending these exercises. It would be so with our children, the great majority of them at least, if they were left to their own choice; and if we feel it our duty to resort to authority in one case, why should we not in the other?

5. In the fifth place, your Committee would earnestly recommend that Presbytery at once consider and adopt some measure in relation to the baptism of children of believing colored parents. In a few of our congregations this ordinance is, it is understood, conscientiously administered in all such cases; but in many of them it is entirely overlooked. Your Committee do not undertake to decide the somewhat mooted question whether the baptismal vows should be assumed by the parent or the master, though they are very decidedly of the opinion that they properly belong to the parent; but they do most earnestly insist that the duty itself should not be overlooked. It is not only an act of injustice to our colored brethren and their offspring, but it is great dishonor and neglect cast upon an institution to which the Saviour has attached the greatest importance. It is often alleged in extenuation of the neglect of this duty, that the authority of colored people over their children is so limited and uncertain that it is not proper to impose upon them the vows of baptismal responsibility. But this your Committee does not regard as a valid objection. The Church ought to do her duty in the premises. If it comes within her province, she ought to see to it that the parent is not restricted in the exercise of the proper authority over his children. If men of the world, over whom she has no control, break up the relationship that ought to exist between the parent and the child, before the latter has attained years of discretion, the sin and responsibility rest upon them, and not upon the Church. Besides which, the child is not deprived of the advantages of baptism by simply being removed from parental control. It is still a member of the visible Church, and enjoys the benefit of the prayers of God's people.

6. In the sixth and last place, the Committee recommend Presbytery to exercise all the influence they can to render sacred and permanent the marriage relation be-

tween our colored people, and especially among the members of the Church. Among the colored people themselves, the most lax views prevail in relation to this matter; but is not much of this to be ascribed to the fact that the whites have not showed the regard they ought for the sanctity of the relationship as existing among their servants? Marriage is a religious as well as a civil institution; and while the Church can exercise no authority over it as a mere civil institution, she can do a great deal to make the colored people feel its sacredness, and she ought to exhort Christian masters to avoid every thing that would lead to the severance of so sacred a tie.

Now, if these various recommendations are fully and heartily carried out, your Committee feel assured that they would be attended with the happiest results. The whites would find themselves actively and happily engaged in a work of love and mercy that has obviously been laid upon their shoulders by the hand of God; and they would soon find themselves more than repaid for all their toils and labors in the increased fidelity and cheerfulness of their servants. And the servants, on the other hand, would entertain feelings of greater self-respect, would put away many of their grovelling vices, and through these varied means, many of them would be brought to the knowledge of the Saviour, and be made to rejoice in His salvation.

R,

n-
h-
t-
at
he
r-
n;
as
ke
to
ld

nd
ey
es
a
on
on
nd
eir
en-
ay
ed
ge

THE SOUTHERN

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVI.—NO. 3.

APRIL, MDCCCLXIV.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHARACTER AND CONDITIONS OF LIBERTY.

Justice and equality the only stable foundation of all natural and moral rule, and of all rights under the government of God; and as such will be maintained and defended by God, who is the hearer and helper of the oppressed.

The Scriptures everywhere authorize us to plead with God, to whom reverence belongs, for His defence of a cause which is RIGHT, whether that cause be personal and private, or public and national. Whether we look to Abraham, or to Jacob, or to Job, or to Moses, or to Joshua, or to the Judges, or to the kings of Judah and Israel, or to Samuel and David, or to the prophets, or to the Maccabees during the lunar night which intervened between the setting and the rising again of the sun of inspiration, we hear one and the same appeal to God; the same humble acknowledgment of personal, national, and ancestral unrighteousness

and ill-desert before him; but at the same time, boldness and confidence in professing their righteousness before men, in protesting against the wickedness and cruelty of their enemies, and the same earnest pleading for their destruction by the interposition of the righteous Governor of heaven and earth. Thus, to quote a most appropriate and encouraging model prayer, Daniel tells us—

"And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes: and I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments; we have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments: neither have we hearkened unto thy servants, the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land. O Lord, *righteousness belongeth unto thee*, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee. O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him."

And that we may quote a specimen of the common language of David and the Psalms, which were prepared and are preserved as, in their spirit and letter, our authorized forms of prayer, we are taught to say—

"Hear the right, O Lord, attend unto my cry, give ear unto my prayer, that goeth not out of feigned lips. Let my sentence come forth from thy presence; let thine eyes behold the things that are equal. Judge me, O Lord; for I have walked in mine integrity: I have trusted also in the Lord; therefore I shall not slide.

"Plead my cause, O Lord, with them that strive with me: fight against them that fight against me. Take hold of shield and buckler,

and stand up for mine help. Draw out also the spear, and stop the way against them that persecute me: say unto my soul, I am thy salvation. Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul: let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt. Let them be as chaff before the wind: and let the angel of the Lord chase them. Let their way be dark and slippery: and let the angel of the Lord persecute them. For without cause have they hid for me their net in a pit, which without cause they have digged for my soul. Let destruction come upon him at unawares; and let his net that he hath hid catch himself: into that very destruction let him fall. And my soul shall be joyful in the Lord: it shall rejoice in his salvation. All my bones shall say, Lord, who is like unto thee, which deliverest the poor from him that is too strong for him, yea, the poor and the needy from him that spoileth him? Lord, how long wilt thou look on? rescue my soul from their destructions, my darling from the lions. I will give thee thanks in the great congregation: I will praise thee among much people. Let not them that are mine enemies wrongfully rejoice over me: neither let them wink with the eye that hate me without a cause. For they speak not peace: but they devise deceitful matters against them that are quiet in the land. This thou hast seen, O Lord: keep not silence: O Lord, be not far from me. Stir up thyself, and awake to my judgment, even unto my cause, my God and my Lord. And my tongue shall speak aloud thy righteousness and of thy salvation, all the day long."*

We may appeal, at another time, to this great cloud of witnesses, to whom we are referred as our exemplars in suffering, affliction, and patience, and as, in part, the foundation of our faith, in illustration of the much misconceived relation in which we stand to *public*, as compared with *personal* and *private* enemies, and the entirely different character of our authorized purposes and prayers concerning them;† but at present we confine our attention to that

* See all Ps. 35, 7, 9, &c.

† From the want of this distinction many Christians and ministers apply Christ's rules given for personal guidance in personal relations and difficulties, to citizens in their relations to their government and country, and to the wicked enemies of their country. They thus make Christ in the Gos-

confiding faith in God, "who executeth justice and judgment for all that are oppressed," which emboldened them while contending even unto blood and the loss of all things, for their homes and heritage, to pray for, and to expect the interposition of God's avenging and omnipotent providence.

If then, as we have seen,* the cause for which the South is now waging war, is unquestionably just and righteous, and our course dictated by a righteous and peace-loving

---

pel contradict Christ in the apostolical writings. (See Romans xiii, 1–8, and 1 Peter ii, 13–15.) They make it a duty to condemn such enemies as wicked, and to oppose, fight against, defeat, and destroy them, and yet we must not pray for success in doing this, and that God may do it for us, and teach us how to fight, and to fight for us. As they are seeking to destroy our country, it is the duty of every citizen to pray for, and to endeavor to secure the infliction of full retributive justice upon them, and to pray, as do the souls of our slaughtered martyrs in heaven: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth."—Rev. vi, 10. (See Rev. xi, 18; Deut. xxxii, 41, 43, &c.)

Our President has changed the character of this war, and brought upon us, we fear, God's anger, and incalculable miseries, by acting according to the personal views and feelings of Mr. Davis, the humane Christian, and not as he is solemnly bound to do, as the President and Ruler of a Government which is the ordinance of God, by whom he has been appointed THE MINISTER OF GOD, A REVENGER, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Has he not, by his unjust clemency and forbearance, provoked the execution upon us of the "curse against those who do the work of the Lord deceitfully, by keeping back their hand from blood?" And yet this distinction is solemnly declared by President Davis, in his proclamation outlawing Butler and his officers:

"Now, therefore, I, Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America, and acting by their authority, appealing to the Divine Judge in attestation that their conduct is not guided by the passion of revenge, but that they reluctantly yield to the solemn duty of repressing, by necessary severity, crimes of which their citizens are the victims, do issue this my proclamation, and by virtue of my authority as Commander-in-chief of the Armies of the Confederate States, do order:

"1st. That all commissioned officers in the command of said Benjamin F. Butler be declared not entitled to be considered as soldiers engaged in honorable warfare, but as robbers and criminals, deserving death; and that they, and each of them, be, whenever captured, reserved for execution."

* Vindication of the War, *So. Pres. Review*, Vol. XV, No. 4.

spirit, we may, while acknowledging our guilt and the righteousness of God's judgments; boldly approach God's throne of justice and judgment, and appealing to His name, His character, His word and promises, and His acts as "made known to Moses" and in ancient times, confidently entreat and anticipate His intervention on our behalf, and that He will be gloriously "known by the judgment He will execute" upon our enemies.

Underlying, as an eternal and immutable basis, all government, human and divine, there is RIGHT, and a righteous equality in its application and enforcement upon all under such dominion, according to their several spheres, capacities, and responsibilities. That is *right*, and a natural, inalienable right, which is according to the rule or standard of duty imposed by the Creator upon the creature, who is made capable of, and subject to moral government; and as rights and responsibilities are determined by the natural capacity, opportunity, and position, allotted by Him who giveth to every man severally as He will, assigning to individuals the bounds of their habitation and their various conditions, as high or low, rich or poor, bond or free—so there is *equality* and liberty to enjoy rights, when the scales of justice are held in an equal hand, and things just and equal are administered to, and required from every man, according to his relative claims. This righteous equality must find its ultimate authority and determination in God's nature and providence, and in that revelation of His will which is made in the nature and necessities of man; in his sense of justice, truth, and honor; in his moral judgment of others; in the universality of laws and penalties, enforced by the combined power of associated communities, for the security of life, liberty, and property, and the preservation of peace, order, and happiness; and in the fuller revelation made of man's natural, social, and spiritual relations and responsibilities in God's inspired word.

Upon these immutable and essential principles, God has established society and made the welfare and happiness of man to depend. As justice and judgment are the foundation of God's throne and government, so are they of all right government among men. For it is no more true that, in order to live at all, men *must* live in associated communities, than that to be happy, prosperous, and exalted, God's providential diversity of natural and relative condition must be recognised and respected, and that every such society must embody as fundamental principles of union, truth, justice, honesty, honor, and mutual confidence, and the assurance that the power of all will be employed in securing faithful and impartial protection in the enjoyment of all recognised relations and rights.

This, as we have formerly seen, is the teaching of the apostle Paul, in his full inspired delineation of civil government, and of the mutual rights, responsibilities, and duties of rulers and people, considered in their *divine* aspect. (See Rom. 13.) We are here infallibly taught, what the history of the world has invariably confirmed, that civil government is the ordinance of God, and is no more voluntary or fortuitous than that of the family, nor any less dependent upon the power of righteousness for its peace and prosperity. The one no more than the other is the creation of man's wisdom or philosophy. They are both alike from and of God, and as necessary to man's comfortable residence upon the earth as is the earth to his subsistence, and requiring for propitious results as diligent moral husbandry as the latter does physical. Both are natural, social, and moral institutions, adapted to man as a fallen, sinful, selfish, and sensual being, under the dominion of Christ as a Saviour, and the dispensation of grace, and yet entirely distinct in their nature, principles, and final end, and intended to bring men into subjection, order and civilization, so as to prepare the way of the Lord, and open

channels along which the waters of salvation may flow freely, and find most ready access to every perishing sinner.

The constitution of society with diversities in rank and condition, including bond and free; and with limitation of rights, so as to secure the most perfect liberty possible to man as sinful and selfish; distinctly pointed out and provided for in God's word—a slaveocracy, God's chosen model and illustration.

Civil government is, therefore, the ordinance of God, *as the moral governor of the world*, founded upon natural principles of equity and benevolence, and having for its end the "good," the general and equal benefit, of all its various ranks and orders, in all their diversified labors, occupations, and interests. Rulers are "God's ministers" to the people ("*every soul*,") for the single purpose of securing to them this "*good*," by the faithful and impartial administration of the constitution and laws under which they exist, and by which they are restrained and limited as "a law unto themselves." Their power is to be exercised so as to secure the happiness and approval of those who "do good," by acting in conformity with the constitution and laws as they may exist, primarily in sovereign states, and derivatively in a common compact; and to execute wrath upon all those who "do evil," by acting in an unconstitutional and illegal manner. Such is civil government as ordained by God, who, as the common Father of all, would by it secure to every man, with equal impartiality, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the unrestricted enjoyment of all rights pertaining to them in their several spheres and relations, as these are established by His providence, and recognised and regulated by the constitution and laws of their country. This is the final end and purpose for which civil government is ordained by God. It is, therefore, to be adapted to this end by the wise expediency of pure and disinterested patriotism, as the changing character and condition of the people may require, so as to perpetuate the

largest liberty; that is, the most secure and untrammelled enjoyment of all personal and relative rights created by God's providence, and guaranteed by the constitution and laws of the country. Government is not an *end*, but a *means to an end.* Government was made for man, and not man for government. Government was made for the "good" of man; that is, for the greatest *possible* good which is practicable, for all who are associated under it, whether high or low, rich or poor, bond or free, master or slave, laborer or ruler, male or female, young or old, unlearned, ignorant, or learned, strong or weak, in a majority or a minority. Men of every natural character and capacity, class, and condition, are thus bound to each other by the law of love, and the law of equity, written on the heart, and revealed by the common legislation and mutual judgment of mankind, under the authority of God as moral governor of the world, and the dispenser of rewards and punishments to nations and individuals.* And this is liberty, whatever may be the form, or however various the elements, of society. Whether it be a slaveocratic or a freesoil republic, or an aristocracy, or an autocracy, or a mixed monarchy, the predominating influence of these two laws, like the two great powers of nature, attraction and gravitation, will secure order, harmony, and the most unrestrained exercise of every right, in the discharge of every duty to ourselves, to each other, and to God—and THIS IS PERFECT LIBERTY. And this is God's end in the ordinance of civil government. It provides and protects liberty to enjoy and to exercise all the rights of men—of moral and ac-

* Under this natural law of God's moral government must be included the law of the Sabbath; for the Sabbath was made for man—as human—in the beginning, in adaptation to his physical, intellectual, and moral nature. As such it has been, in some form, common to men; and it is as thus naturally divine and necessary, and not as adopted and enforced by Christianity, our governments may be properly urged to acknowledge and reverence and protect it, and can consistently do so.

countable subjects of the divine government—in whatever rank or condition God has providentially placed them, and from which no ordinance of man can displace them, without overthrowing liberty and introducing anarchy, or tyranny, or the utter destruction of any existing society.

This is the highest liberty of which man is capable. It implies the highest exercise of his noblest powers and prerogatives. It presupposes an enlightened capacity to discern what are rights, personal and relative, and a conscience to exercise them, void of offence towards God and man. Rights apart from responsibilities; privileges unaccompanied by obligations to service; personal security, provision and enjoyment, independent of their diffusion in equal and impartial measure, through the entire community; is the wild dream of visionary speculation. It is to put the power of right into the hands of a madman, who will only use it in scattering around him firebrands, arrows, and death. It would be to turn every man into an Ishmaelite, whose hand is against every man, and every man's hand against him. Liberty is coördinate with law. They coexist and characterize each other. They are inseparable. Though twain, they are one, and indispensable to a perfect condition of society; just as humanity, while divided into distinct sexes, is only complete by their re-union in the mystic bond of matrimony; and both are alike the ordinance of God, for securing to man the greatest amount of liberty and happiness. Liberty and loyalty to law, God has constituted the balance wheels by which a well-regulated government is carried on, secure from friction; or the two poles around which its complicated machinery moves in quiet harmony. Loyalty to law, and to all rights under the law; and liberty to all to act in accordance with them; this is that righteous equality which exalteth a nation, and departure from which will bring reproach upon any people. Such is man's nature in relation to society, and such is society as adapted by God to that nature. To render His

purposes unmistakably clear, God has not only given us the history of man's experiments in all the possible forms of human government, including His own theocratic republic, and the explicit instructions of the apostle Paul on the nature of civil government, *considered in its relation to God;* He has imparted an equally full inspired delineation of what civil government should be, *considered in its relation to human agency*, by the apostle Peter, (see 1 Pet., ch. 2,) in his general epistle to Christians in various countries; and in all ages, He assumes that every where society is made up of various classes of freemen, all of whom are to be treated with the "honor" due to their intrinsic worth and relative position, and also a class of laboring population who are slaves, and do not participate in the government. Free born citizens are considered as possessing the rights of freedom, and liberty to exercise them, which it is made their duty to do, so that they may, by influence and example, promote the public welfare, and preserve society from coming under the control of unprincipled demagogues. The liberty to exercise their rights as freemen they are to use by a conscientious conformity to every ordinance or constitution, created or framed by those entitled to do so, and in a constitutional manner.* Slaves, on the contrary, are to submit

---

* See Poole and Doddridge in loco. We apply, however, the terms *free* and *liberty* to civil rights, which are to be exercised under the influence of Christian motives. For just as such motives are to actuate slaves in submitting to the deprivation of *such* rights, and in *obeying even unjust and unmerciful* masters, so are they to influence those who as freemen enjoy them. The example is in the right use of liberty, as freemen having political rights, and in acting as such, and not, like slaves, by an involuntary submission to whatever government they might live under.

The iniquitous course of certain heretical and deluded men, condemned by the apostle, was similar to that of the modern Anabaptists and Covenanters; and consisted in denouncing all civil government as anti-Christian, unless it is a government of saints, and based on the principles of the Christian religion, and acknowledgment of the supremacy of Christ's dominion, and authority of the Bible. The sophistry of the argument by which some would now revive this doctrine and urge it upon our Church,

with equal conscientiousness to every constitutional law binding upon them, and both classes are to be made happy in enjoying their respective rights and privileges, and in performing their respective duties by Christian motives, and by a supreme regard to the example and conduct of Christ; and while thus delineating the human aspect of civil government, the apostle Peter re-affirms the doctrine of Paul respecting its divine origin and authority. Whatever may be the particular form of government, (*every*,) if it is constitutionally organized upon principles of equity, and has for its end the common *good* of all, by securing the utmost possible liberty in the exercise of the largest possible rights and privileges, equally and impartially, to all entitled to them, then it is "*sent*" by God.

Let it be borne in mind that, in both of these divine expositions of civil government and social rights and liberty to enjoy the benefits of all, we have, as their selected exemplar, a slaveocratic kingdom—a slaveocracy—in which the laboring class are slaves, and that this is declared to be a divine ordinance, and *sent by God* for the greatest good, both of the slave and the free; and that it is declared to consist with liberty to enjoy and to exercise all the rights proper to man in a state of society. Let it be remembered that this was also the character of God's own ancient republic. Let it be emphatically taught that the greatest and most prosperous and most permanent ancient nations, embodied a large slave population; that this has been the character of every kingdom under the whole heavens from the beginning hitherto, until atheistic infidelity revived the impious doc-

---

lies in confounding God's recognition and authority, and law, *as moral governor in the kingdom of nature and providence*, with that of God as He is revealed in Scripture, as God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself.

It may be proper to say, that this argument was substantially written before similar views on this point were published in the last number of this Review.

trine of man's natural independence and absolute equality—a doctrine which hurled Satan and his host from heaven, drove our first parents out of Paradise, and filled the world with that deluge of misery and wickedness in which it is still irretrievably plunged, groaning and travailing in pain together until now. Let every one who has ears to hear, consider the overwhelming moral demonstration that a slaveocratic government may be God's ordinance, and consistent with all the rights, and liberty to enjoy them, which are now proper to man as corrupt and degraded, according to his capacity and condition, which is derived from the fact that, during the eighteen centuries of the Christian era, as it had been through all the thousands of preceding dispensations, the Church of God has always, every where, and by every sect and denomination, until the recent reintroduction from primitive antichristianism of the *higher law* doctrine of abolitionist infidelity,* sustained and defended it.

Universal testimony and experience confirm the teachings of God's word, as to man's character and incapacity in the mass for self-government and sovereign rights and unrestricted liberty, and as to the limitations necessary to that order and security which are the only foundation of equal rights, permanent liberty, and prosperous government.

God's word, like a heavenly luminary, shines amid the darkling obscurity of human reason, to guide tempest-tossed vessels in the only safe and prosperous course over the dangerous sea of national life. Experience, as developed in the fateful course of empires, like the stern-light of a ship, has confirmed the truth of Scripture, by disclosing in its wake the wrecks of nations, the floating timbers of scattered constitutions, and the bloated corpses of vain and

* This was one of the first infidel heresies against which the apostles pronounced condemnation and excommunication. (See 1 Tim., 6.)

ambitious rulers, who, wise in their own conceit, have substituted philosophy, falsely so called, for the wisdom of God, to whom alone is fully known all that is in man and how to control and to combine the hidden mysteries of his wonderful nature, so as, out of its discordant and naturally repellent elements, to constitute a prosperously united and harmonious society. What is man? Surely this is the first question in political science; for with what has that science to do but with man? with man, not as he *might* be, or as he *ought* to be, or as by philosophy, falsely so called, he is theoretically portrayed; not with man as he has been romantically associated by Platonic affections, or Utopian dreams, or the heartless abstractions of a Hobbes, or a Helvetius; not with man as he came forth from the atheistic and ferocious laboratory of the French revolutionists; but with man as he is, and as he ever, and every where, has been; as he is now, amid all the civilization, education, and refinement of the nineteenth century, and as he ever shall be, except so far as he is transformed by the renewing of his individual mind, by the transforming power of the glorious gospel of the blessed God. What does political philosophy propose to do with man? Its object is to associate men *just as they are by nature*, and to organize them into communities, states, and kingdoms; to bind them together by laws adapted to provide for every man the most perfect security in the pursuit of his own happiness and interests, that is compatible with the peace, order, and prosperity of the whole. Political science is, therefore, eminently practical. It has to do with all that comes home most directly to man's business and bosom. It has to do with man's every day wants, employments, and enjoyments. It has to take into account man's good and bad qualities; his weaknesses and wants; his desires and demands; his pride, passion, and discontent; his envy, jealousy, and ambition; his indolence, selfishness, self-indulgence, and sensuality; his licentiousness, lawlessness, and duplicity; his ignorance,

prejudice, and indifference to the rights of others; his mercenary and venal spirit; his malignant party rage and malevolent dissatisfaction with the unavoidable inequalities of rank and condition. All these characteristics are not found in every man. They are variously developed or restrained or counteracted. But that they are prevalent and predominant elements of human nature, we demonstrate by the character of all legislation; the checks and balances, restraints and punishments, and the sleepless vigilance of an all-permeating and every where present police; which have constituted the actual machinery of every society of whose existence any knowledge is preserved. Another line of demonstration is found in the recorded history, decline, and fall of all former empires, and the character and condition of those now pursuing their destiny through the transformations which have already marked their eventful career. Nor is it a less significant proof of the real character of man, that political writers of every school, from absolute despotism to the fiercest democracy, have taught that, in order to enjoy any security in society, man's natural, that is, his individual rights—if, as is denied by absolutists, he has any—are altogether, or as far as may be found necessary, given up, to be restored by his government, so far as *the general* good will allow, or its character will permit.

Even Locke restrains the theoretically assumed natural liberty of man "within the bounds of the law of nature," that is, as we have stated, the law written in his heart as a subject of the moral government of God. Liberty thus restrained is, says Blackstone, "a right inherent in us by birth, and one of the gifts of God to man at his creation." And yet such is man's present character that, in order to organize society, this natural liberty must be limited and abridged, because "legal obedience and conformity is infinitely more valuable than the wild and savage liberty which is sacrificed to obtain it." That which diminishes the natural liberty of mankind is, says Blackstone, "the law which restrains a

man from doing mischief to his fellow citizens." Society, therefore, is obliged to restrain, as has been said, "not the natural *liberty*, but the natural *tyranny* of man." Well does Burke teach that, in order to secure *some* liberty, "we make a surrender in trust of *the whole of it.*" "Why," asks Locke, "will a man part with *this perfect freedom?*" "Because," he answers, "though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain and constantly exposed to the invasion of others, for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part not strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state (?) *is very unsafe, very insecure.* This makes him willing to quit a condition which, *however* free, (?) is *full of fears and continual dangers*, and join with those who unite for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates." (On Gov. ch. ix.)

Jefferson believed that men should hold on to these supposed natural rights, even in society; but that such was human nature, that a bloody revolution, like the French, was necessary every few years, in order that the oppressed minority might regain their lost possession of rights and liberty.

Mr. Calhoun, in his profound work on Government, very emphatically confirms the above testimonies. Man, as he teaches, is impelled to ordain government by his social and his selfish feelings; the former seeking gratification in association with others, and the latter in securing his own interests at whatever sacrifice of those of others, and leading, with all the inevitable necessity of the law of gravitation, to disorder and conflict between individuals. "And hence the tendency to a universal state of conflict between individual and individual, accompanied by the connected passions of suspicion, jealousy, anger, and revenge, followed by insolence, fraud, and cruelty; and if not prevented by some controlling power, ending in a state of universal discord and confusion destructive to the social state."

(Works, Vol. 1, p. 4.) Government is, therefore, as necessary to preserve society, as is society to preserve life. But, as this character actuates man under government, and leads to disorder, corruption, and abuse of power, "as all experience and almost every page of history testify," "to repress violence, preserve order, and prevent government from being converted into an instrument to oppress the rest," a constitution becomes necessary to define, distribute, limit, and protect government. But as the same "nature of man, constituted as he is," will misinterpret any constitution, and pervert and convert it into an instrument of tyranny; and as it will employ for this purpose the power of party association, sectional interests and prejudices, lust of power and of the "*spoils*" and patronage of power, and the all-controlling influences of universal sovereignty and suffrage, public opinion, (*so called,*) the press, the convention, the caucus, the bribe, and "log-rolling lobbyism;" *a constitution,* however perfect, can only be preserved, *and practically and honestly* perpetuated, by adequate provisions for the distribution and regulation of power, for the limitation of the rights of citizenship, sovereignty, suffrage, for the equal representation of all sections and interests, and for the restraint of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of government, by mutual checks and vetoes, and by the power of amending, altering, or abrogating the government, and forming another in a constitutional manner. (*See p.* 12, *and the rest of Vol.* 1, *in which is traced with fearfully prophetic foresight and warning the whole course of the corruption, decline, and fall of the United States.*)

To these authorities we will only add the concurrent views of that "profound thinker and real statesman," and freethinker in religion, Montesquieu. Though admiting, like the others, the assumed existence of natural equality and freedom, and his preference for a democratic form of government, he feels compelled to conclude that experimentally such an equality is impracticable, by reason

of the selfish injustice and rapacity of man. Inequalities must exist, in order that real equality, according to capacity, knowledge, and virtue, may rightfully direct and govern. "For example," says he, "it may be apprehended that *people who are obliged to live by labor*, (all the laboring, mechanical, and working classes of society,) would be too much impoverished by public employment, or *neglect* the duties of attending to it; that *artisans would grow insolent;* and that too great a number of freedmen would (as they did in the Roman empire,) overpower the ancient citizens. *In this case the equality in a democracy may be suppressed, for the good of the State.*"

Similar conclusions have been arrived at, even by the most thoughtful and profound of Northern fanatical abolitionists. Dr. Channing, amid all his rhetorical declamation about inherent and inalienable rights, was compelled by conviction of the truth, to admit that "like every citizen, he (the slave) is subject to the community, and *the community has a right,* AND IS BOUND, *to continue all such restraints as its own safety and the well-being of the slave demands;*" that is, the right of the community to secure the general welfare is paramount to any supposititious inherent and inalienable right of those who are slaves. "If he," (the slave,) adds Dr. Channing, "cannot be induced to work by rational and natural motives, *he should be obliged to labor*, on the same principle on which the vagrant in other (that is, Free-soil) communities *is confined and compelled to earn his own bread.* The gift of liberty would be a mere name, and worse than nominal, were he (the slave) to be let loose on society under circumstances driving him to commit crime, and for which he would be condemned to severer bondage than he had escaped;" "and," continues Dr. Channing, "*it would be cruelty, not kindness*, to give him (*and, of course, any white freeman*) that which he is unprepared to understand or enjoy. It would *be cruelty* to strike the fetters from a man whose first steps would *infallibly* lead him to a precipice."

And now let us hear "The author of the Moral and Political Science," as Dr. Wayland authoritatively styles himself. What, according to this profound teacher, is the best form of government, and the one which may best claim to be "the ordinance of God?" "The best form of government," answers Dr. W., "for ANY people (*white or black, bond or free,*) is the best that its *moral condition* renders *practicable.* A people, (*or a majority of them,*) may be *so entirely* surrendered to the influence of passion, and *so feebly* influenced by moral restraints, that a government which relied on moral restraint would not exist for a single day. In this case, a subordinate and inferior principle remains—the principle of fear—and the only resort is to a government of force; and such do we see to be the fact." The *moral condition* of men is, therefore, the determiner of the best form of government for any people, and the measure by which political rights, the elective franchise, and qualification for office, are to be limited or extended, and the experience of the world is the proof. "While the moral restraints are too feeble for self-government, a *hereditary* government * * * may be as good as the people can sustain. As they advance in intellectual and moral cultivation, it may advantageously (whatever may be said about all men being born alike free and equal,) become more and more *elective;* and in a suitable moral condition, (of the whole people,) it may be wholly so; and yet, as it is better that a man should do right than wrong, *even though he be forced to do it,* it is well he should pray others (if free, or have others, if slave) to force him, if there be no other way of *insuring* his good conduct. GOD HAS RENDERED THE BLESSING OF FREEDOM INSEPARABLE FROM MORAL RESTRAINT TO THE INDIVIDUAL, AND HENCE IT IS VAIN FOR A PEOPLE (OR A MAJORITY OF THEM) TO EXPECT TO BE FREE, UNLESS THEY ARE FIRST WILLING TO BE VIRTUOUS." And so unalterable is this rule of God's moral government of men, individually and nationally, that, as Dr. Wayland proceeds to show, "the

form of government will always adjust itself to the moral condition of a people."

In regard specially to the slave portion of a people, Dr. Wayland teaches that "the DUTY of slaves is explicitly made known in the Bible. They are *bound to obedience*, fidelity, submission, and respect to their masters; not only to the good and kind, but also to the unkind and froward; not, however, (as is equally, and all the more powerfully, true of wives and children,) on the ground of duty to man merely, BUT ON THE GROUND OF DUTY TO GOD.* The relation, responsibilities, and duties of slaves toward "their MASTERS," is, therefore, ordained and regulated, and made authoritative by God, and to be fulfilled as in his sight, and under his immediate command. Such, according to Dr. Wayland, is the teaching of God in the New Testament, whose language he quotes; and "that the Hebrews held slaves from the time of the conquest of Canaan, and that Abraham and the patriarchs held them many centuries before, this, also," says Dr. Wayland, "I grant." "I grant, also, that Moses enacted laws with *special* reference to that relation." "I wonder," he very significantly adds, by way of rebuke to his less candid Abolition friends, "that any should have had the hardihood to deny so plain a matter. I should almost as soon deny the *delivery* of the ten commandments to Moses."

We have thus established the position, that the law which constitutes the natural and necessary basis of all social and civil government among men is the moral law, summarily comprehended in the ten commandments; written in the beginning in man's heart; manifested in all man's mutual judgments, enactments, and *summary* as well as *legal* executions of justice upon his fellow men; embodied in every form of civil government; every where and at all times;

* Sometimes the manner and motive of obedience are reversed. Thus in Ps. 123, 2: "As the eyes of a maiden look unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord," &c.

constituting that justice and judgment which are the foundation of God's throne, as the moral governor of the world, the ordainer of society, and the dispenser of natural rewards and punishments to individuals and to nations; and the rule and standard of that *righteousness* and equality which are the *price*, and the only price, at which prosperity—that is, peace, freedom, liberty, successful, happy industry, and the enjoyment of all personal, family, and social rights, privileges, and blessings—can be procured, preserved, and perpetuated. If ever any moral, or politically moral truth connected with man's conduct and history was demonstrated, this, we think, has been by every variety and form of proof; from the universal experience and testimony of men; from the rise, continuance, decline, and fall of empires; from the deductions of the wisest and most sagacious philosophers of all ages, schools, and parties; from the clear and unmistakable instructions of God's revealed word; and from the self-condemning attestations of fanatical modern Abolitionists. Even these have been compelled to come into court, and to give evidence against themselves, and against the hypocrisy, sophistry, incredulity, and infidelity of their followers and abettors.

A recognition of truth, justice, and of the rightful claims of others; obedient reverence for authority and law; a solemn conviction of the guilt and necessary punishment of crimes; a love of country stronger than death, superior to danger, and making it sweet even to die on her behalf; and all this based on a controlling sense of religious responsibility to a divine lawgiver, judge, and avenger; this will be found to have been the life, the power, the cohesive bond, the invigorating principle, and the loss of it, the decay and death, of all nations hitherto. "God and the right" is the battle cry of all modern civilization; and a government which ignores or practically denies their claims, is monstrously unnatural and doomed to inevitable perdition.

The only liberty now possible to man is the liberty of law. The only rights now inherent and inalienable to man, are those which are recognised, restricted, and regulated by the law of his nature; which is the law of his Creator, Governor, and Judge; the law which assigns to him his birth, his condition, his capacities, his relation to the family, to society, and to the state; the law which imposes corresponding responsibilities and requires correlative duties; the law which binds him in love and equity to seek and to secure the rights of all other men as they, too, are variously distributed by the common Father of all; and the law which, as surely as the laws of matter, shapes the destiny of individuals and communities, and dispenses happiness or misery, prosperity or adversity, contentment and cheerfulness, or pining misanthropy and sullen discontent, long life and the good will of others, or retaliation, hatred, and revenge.

These principles substantially recognised by our fathers in framing the Constitution—but ultimately subverted by the infidel maxims of the Declaration of Independence, and their demoralizing influence on the increasing mass of ignorant foreign citizens: the result—liberty lost, the Union broken up, and war, subjugation, and lawless tyranny. God's prophetic warning fulfilled. Exodus 34, 7, *explained.*

Our fathers recognised these principles, and their relation and responsibility to God.* They embodied them in their

* On occasion of recommending a fast—June 12, 1775—Congress declared that "the great Governor of the world, by His supreme and universal providence, not only conducts the course of nature with unerring wisdom and rectitude, but frequently influences the minds of men to serve the wise and gracious purposes of His providential government; that it is, at all times, our indispensable duty, devoutly to acknowledge His superintending providence, and to reverence and adore His immutable justice." They say (March 16, 1776,) they are "desirous to have people of all ranks and degrees duly impressed with a solemn sense of God's superintending providence, and of their duty devoutly to rely, in all their lawful enterprises, on His aid and direction." They declare the end of setting apart the day

separate governments, as free, sovereign, and independent States; and they carried them, with all their experience during their colonial, revolutionary, and confederate history, into the confederate system of government, under one common, qualified, and restricted union, entered into to provide for their common defence, promote their general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty, so long enjoyed under their separate governments, against all encroachments from other States and from other nations. By solemn compact between the several States entering into it, as it seemed to them good, certain powers only were specifically delegated, in trust, to the government of the United States; and *all others*, including, as their constitutions declare, freedom, sovereignty, and independence, with a veto power and a right to amend the constitutional compact, were reserved to the governments of the respective States as coordinate governments. In their nature and principles they

---

to be, "that we may with united hearts confess and bewail our manifold sins and transgressions, and by a sincere repentance and amendment of life, appease His righteous displeasure, and, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, obtain His pardon and forgiveness." March 7, 1778, they recommend a similar day, "that, at one time and with one voice, the inhabitants may acknowledge the righteous dispensations of Divine Providence, confess their iniquities and transgressions, and implore the mercy and forgiveness of God, and beseech Him that vice, profaneness, extortion, and every evil may be done away, and that we may be a reformed and happy people." Another proclamation of March 11, 1780, recommends, "that we may, with one heart and one voice, implore the Sovereign Lord of heaven and earth to remember mercy in His judgment, to make us sincerely penitent for our transgressions, to banish vice and irreligion from among us, and establish virtue and piety by His divine grace." March 20, 1781, "That we may with united hearts confess and bewail our manifold sins and transgressions, and by sincere repentance and amendment of life, appease His righteous displeasure, and, through the merits of our blessed Saviour, obtain pardon and forgiveness; that it may please Him to inspire our rulers with incorruptible integrity, and to direct and prosper their councils; that it may please Him to bless all schools and seminaries of learning, and to grant that truth, justice, and benevolence, and pure and undefiled religion, may universally prevail."

were all alike, the government of the States being adapted to a community of sovereign citizens, and that of the United States to a community of sovereign States; all were alike constitutional republics, based upon the assumed virtue and intelligence of all their constituent members. To secure this, they limited and exalted the rights of citizenship and the sovereign prerogative of the elective franchise; separated the right and power of making constitutions, framing laws, and governing under the constitution and laws when made; distributed the powers of government into three coördinate, and yet independent branches; guarded the purity of elections, and restrained their too frequent and popular character; provided for free, responsible, and yet independent *representatives* of all classes and interests among the people, unrestricted and uninstructed, in contradistinction to mere instructed deputies; divided the legislative body into two houses, the one elected for two years, and the other, the Senate, removed still further from the influence of popular excitement by length of service, power of restraint on the popular Assembly, and participation in the governing or executive power of the State and country; placed supreme executive power, with the sovereign right of veto upon the combined action of both houses of the legislature, in the hands of a chief magistrate, assisted by the advice of coordinate heads of departments of the government; erected a judiciary system whose members were made entirely independent of popular or personal control, by the source and tenure of their appointment, the fixed amount of their salaries, and by their power to decide upon the constitutionality of all laws and acts of assumed extra-constitutional power; by protecting legislators and judges against all interference with their independent official rights of opinion and of action; by securing to minorities full and unrestricted power of employing every constitutional means of favorably presenting their views; by guaranteeing to every citizen the great fundamental rights of *habeas corpus* and

trial by jury; and in short, by a system of checks and balances which have made their system of government the wonder and admiration and envy of the world. It was imbued with the spirit of practical wisdom, sagacity, and knowledge of human nature, and it ignored the infidel and atheistical maxims of the absolute freedom and equality of all men, found in the Declaration of Independence—Jefferson, the promulgator of these anarchical principles of wild and savage fanaticism, being absent in Paris, and not a party to the framing of the constitution. Mr. Calhoun expresses the opinion that to plan, or construct, or reduce to practice, such a government, exceeds the power of human sagacity, has ever done so, and he thinks ever will. "For the structure, therefore, of such a system as that of the constitution and government of the United States—a political system as remarkable for its grandeur as for its novelty and refinement of organization—so wise, just, and beneficent—we are indebted *far more* to a superintending providence, that so disposed events as to lead, as if by an invisible hand, to its formation, than to those who erected it. Intelligent, experienced, patriotic, as they were, they were but the builders under its superintending direction."* But while our constitution was "the proudest political monument of the combined and progressive wisdom of man, and a choice and peerless model, uniting all the beauties of proportion with all the solidity of strength," experience has shown that it was fatally defective. It failed to make a due recognition of its dependence for all practical efficiency, upon the moral government and law of God. It failed to recognise the Sabbath as an institute of God's natural and moral government, and adapted alike to man's physical, intellectual, and moral nature. It failed to provide sufficiently against the established character of man, as a sinful and selfish being, whose nature, constituted as

* Works, Vol. 1, pp. 8, 78, 164, 199.

it now is, will, as unquestionably as the law of gravitation, abuse power as an instrument to aggrandize self and to injure and oppress others. It possessed no self-preserving power. Founded upon the assumption of intelligence and virtue as the only rightful basis of its sovereign rights of citizenship, it nevertheless opened the way for the too easy admission to their enjoyment, of hundreds of thousands, mostly without either intelligence or virtue, who annually poured themselves as a flood tide upon our shores from all parts of the world. It left the way open, by construction, for concentrating in the Supreme Court a power which has subordinated the courts, and through them the government of the States, to that of the United States, by a negative on all their acts; for extending the powers of Congress beyond constitutional limits, so as to allow sectional legislation; and for concentrating in the hands of the President a discretionary power, which placed at his disposal "*the spoils*," so that, according to his will and pleasure, uncontrolled and unregulated by Congress, he distributed all the honors and emoluments of government, and all offices held under it, throughout the length and breadth of the land; and in this way most effectually controlled elections, intensified political animosities, and fostered sectional jealousy and ambition, and perpetuated in the hands of a party the combined legislative, judicial, and executive functions of the government. From these causes the Constitution of the United States was rendered inffectual in resisting the irrepressible conflict of Northern and Southern interests and views, or to provide against the possibility of a sectional majority of States and people wielding the power of the electoral body, and against an overwhelming majority of the voting citizens of the country giving up a government, intended to represent the interests of *all* sections, to a factious, usurping, and tyrannical party. It did not adequately protect the sovereign character and rights of States against the sectional and antagonistic legislation of

other States, and the executive in combination with them, nor provide a remedy against their unconstitutional disregard of the authority of the Supreme Court and the sacred guarantees of the Constitution, and its fundamental State rights of veto, nullification, amendment, and secession.*

But more than all other causes of failure, and the source of all others, the constitution and government of the United States failed because the spirit of moderation, forbearance, mutual respect, concession, and compromise, which at first secured their adoption, were abandoned when the pressure of impending dangers gave place to unparalleled prosperity, and the North found itself fattening upon the slave labor it had introduced, and the various bounties, navigation laws, and protective tariffs by which it was aggrandized and the South impoverished, until lifted up with pride and bloated with pampered indulgence and intoxicating vice, its vaulting ambition overleaped itself, and fell on the other side.

It was at best, as Washington described it, "an experiment, and as near an approach to perfection as was thought

* This opinion was held by Hamilton, Madison, and many others. How traitorously and perfidiously it influenced the merely selfish and sectional New England politicians is illustrated in reference to President Adams, in Jefferson's works, vol. 4, pages 516 and 517. He (Jefferson) thus remarks:

"December 13, 1803.—The Reverend Mr. Coffin, of New England, who is now here soliciting donations for a College in Greene county, Tennessee, tells me that when he first determined to engage in this enterprise, he wrote a paper recommendatory, which he meant to get signed by clergymen, and a similar one for persons in a civil character, at the head of which he wished Mr. Adams, then President of the United States, to put his name only, and not for a donation. Mr. Adams, after reading the paper and considering, said: 'He saw no possibility of continuing the union of the States; that their dissolution must necessarily take place; that he, therefore, saw no propriety in recommending to New England men to promote a literary institution in the South; that it was, in fact, giving strength to those who were to be their enemies, and, therefore, he would have nothing to do with it.' Edited by Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Charlottesville, 1829."

This was the first egg hatched for a dissolution of the Union in 1803, by a New England President whilst in office.

attainable by human wisdom." The future was regarded by him and the fathers of the republic with anxious trepidation. The dangers to which it was exposed were to a great extent foreseen; and Washington's farewell address, in unison with the writings of his illustrious compeers, warned the future citizens and rulers of the country of those very rocks and quicksands upon which the noble ship of state, which they had with so much blood, suffering, and treasure, equipped and put to sea, has been so soon and so fatally wrecked.

The ultimate source of so speedy and unanticipated destruction of the well founded hopes of our fathers, must be traced to those maxims already alluded to, which Jefferson had embodied in the Declaration of Independence, "into which," as has been said, "was poured the soul of the American continent," melted by the fires of revolution and the white heat of the French red republicanism then illuminating the world by the blaze of its anti-monarchical and anti-christian principles, on whose bloody altar were consumed every relic of constitutional and well regulated society. The temple of our liberty was, therefore, sacrilegiously polluted, while yet fresh from the hands of its architects. Under the administration and influence of Jefferson and his followers, God was set aside, and His moral government repudiated. Divine providence, infallible wisdom, and unalterable necessity, as exhibited in the diversities of human condition, capacity, rights, and responsibilities, were, in the progress of these principles, scornfully rejected. Human nature was enthroned. Reason was deified. The voice of the people became the voice of God. The will of the numerical majority constituted the supreme law, above and beyond which there was no authoritative tribunal or retributive justice. THE PRICE OF LIBERTY WAS NOT PAID. Her claim was set aside. The bond was cancelled. The constitution was handed over gradually to popular construction and sectional intrigue. Its guards

and checks were removed. The exalted privilege of citizenship, and the sovereign right of voting, were, by every possible fraudulent device, extended indiscriminately to foreigners, who, in proportion to their ignorance and venality, were purchased by party bribes, and thus, at once, relieved from all conscientious scruples, and taught that liberty was license to secure their own interest, regardless of the public good. Trading in politics and living upon the fruits of elections, became the exclusive occupation and life of increasing multitudes, who found in the accumulating mass of foreigners, who had neither intelligence nor virtue to discern the principles of party, nor any interest, property, or position at stake on the results, abundant material on which to work. The caucus and convention gave such professional politicians opportunity to combine their strength, to forestall public opinion, to accumulate resources, to multiply agencies, and so completely to control the masses as either to discomfit or discourage and disgust the virtuous and intelligent, and bring the government of the country under their own power. The electoral college became a mere automatic registry of the results of such conventions, in the election of their chosen leader and patron. In the States these causes have led—in all except South Carolina—to the entire transformation and transference of the government. Universal suffrage has passed daily more and more from "the ancient citizens" into the hands of comparative strangers, with little capacity or intelligence, and less of patriotic sincerity. All the securities and checks against the evil of popular misrule ceased to operate. All elections were given over to the hands of the people. Even judges are now appointed by popular vote; and that they may be more completely subsidized and corrupted, their tenure of office is made annual or biennial, and their salary changeable at pleasure, and insignificantly small. The result is, that the government of our States and country has been committed indiscriminately to the mere numerical mass of

the people—a mass by nature corrupt and ready to be corrupted still more; selfish, sectional, ignorant, and prejudiced; averse to restraint; vain and conceited; envious and jealous; whose liberty has always been "licentious, fierce, and wild;" and a majority of whom, according to the most favorable testimony of the most democratic and liberal writers, and the invariable experience of the ages, will always prey upon the rest, and render life, liberty, property, and every right dear to man, "*very insecure*," and subordinate to their acquisition or retention of power and accumulation of profits.

The final result is now before us. Liberty is gone in the United States. The avalanche of corruption, long gathering, has fallen with sudden and overwhelming destruction. It has swept before it, and buried amid its ruins, the constitution and the union, the supreme court, *habeas corpus*, trial by jury, freedom of the press, freedom of opinion, freedom of action, and freedom of religion, and every obstacle to the unlimited exercise of arbitrary military despotism. The president has become a military dictator; his mansion a palace; his attendants armed troops; his presence among the people attested by the glittering pageantry of an imperial guard; his will the death-warrant of generals and subjects; and his most puerile and egotistical speeches must be heard in abject silence, or fawning, sycophantic adulation and applause.* He has not found it necessary to abrogate or alter the "forms" of government, state or national. He has found in them his greatest strength, and the easily adapted means of riveting the chains of servility upon a crushed and abject people. Universal suffrage, in the hands of a hireling mob, has become the right arm of arbitrary power; and, as in France it has been made by Napoleon to establish the firm foundation of an imperial dynasty on the ruins of a republic, so has it enabled Lincoln to con-

* He stopped short in a recent speech, and ordered a man to prison, who had uttered a word of common ejaculation.

solidate his power by the invincible union of the mass of a corrupt and venal people, and thus to create, as it did in the decline of Rome, the worst of despotisms—the combination of tyrant and mob.* Thus overruled by force, and cajoled by promises of coming recompense in the agrarian distribution of the spoils of all *disloyal* and discontented citizens, the virtuous, intelligent, and patriotic of all parties, see themselves in the hands of a heartless tyrant, hardened into callous ferocity by "scenes which," as Lord Brougham says, "modern ages—nay, which Christian times (*eighteen centuries*) have seen nothing to equal—a spectacle at which the whole world stands aghast, almost to incredulity,"†—a

* The Eighteen Christian Centuries, pp. 32, 37.

† "Whatever may have been the proximate cause of the contest, its continuance is the result of a national vanity without example and without bounds. Individuals subject to this failing are despised, not hated; and it is an ordinary expression respecting him who is without this weakness, that he is too proud to be vain. But when a people are seized with it, they change the name, and call it love of glory. Of the individual, we often hear the remark that, despicable as the weakness is, it leads to no bad action. Nothing can be more false. It leads to many crimes, and to that disregard of truth, which is the root of all offences. Certainly it produces none of the worst crimes. The man who is a prey to vanity thirsts not for the blood of a neighbor. How fearfully otherwise is it, when a nation is its slave! Magnifying itself beyond measure, and despising the rest of mankind, blinded and intoxicated with self-satisfaction, persuaded that their very crimes are proofs of greatness, and believing that they are both admired and envied, the Americans have not only not been content with the destruction of half a million, but been vain of slaughter. Their object being to retain a great name among nations for their extent of territory, they exulted in the wholesale bloodshed by which it must be accomplished, because others were unable to make such a sacrifice. The struggle of above two years, which loosened all the bonds which held society together, and gave to millions the means of showing their capacity, has produced no genius, civil or military, while the submission to every caprice of tyranny had been universal and habitual, and never interrupted by a single act of resistance to the most flagrant infractions of personal freedom. The mischiefs of mob supremacy have been constantly felt; for the calamity of national and respectable men keeping aloof from the management of affairs, has resulted in the tyranny of the multitude. To this tyrant, the nominal rulers

tyrant who now wields absolute control of the sword and the purse, the press and the polls; and they find themselves also at the mercy of a people tyrannized and flattered, who are no less cruel than himself. "O liberty!" as Madam Roland, from bitter experience, exclaimed, "what fearful crimes are committed in thy name!"

Thus rapidly has liberty, perverted and prostituted, *leaped* from licentious freedom into the arms of abject tyranny, over all the ordinary stages of faction, war, anarchy, weakness, utter weariness of mobocratic government, into the arms of an abject submission to arbitrary power. The price of liberty was not paid, and the avenging arm of outraged and provoked Deity is exacting the penalty to the uttermost farthing, from perjury, corruption, hypocrisy, tyranny, and inhumanity. God requireth the past; and though He suffereth long, and is slow to anger, yet He will make it assuredly known by His judgments, that according to His fearful threatenings so is His wrath.

"But a few years since," says the *Examiner*, "the prediction that a President would venture to abolish, or the people submit to be deprived of so cherished and inestimable a safe-guard of liberty, would have been received as the ravings of a madman. Yet we have lived to see this, and a hundred other usurpations, tamely acquiesced in by a people who boasted of their jealous attachment to constitutional

---

have never withheld their submission; and the press, catering for the appetites of the populace, and pandering to their passions, has persisted in every misrepresentation which might most disguise the truth as to passing events, exaggerating each success, extenuating each defeat, often describing failure as victory; while the multitude, if the truth by chance reached them, were one day sunk in despair, another elated to ecstasy, almost at the pleasure of their rulers and their guides. Nor were the falsehoods thus propagated confined to the events of the war; they extended to all things—to the measures of the government and the acts of foreign nations. The public feeling must not be thwarted; the people desired to hear whatever gratified their vanity or raised their spirits; and in this delusion must they live as long as the war lasts, and the rule is in the hands of the mob. The truth, they will never hear, because they desire to hear what is pleasing, and not what is true."

government, who flaunted the banners of republicanism defiantly in the face of the world, and arrogantly proclaimed their mission of converting the earth to the democratic faith.

"This wonderful change has been not less unexampled for its rapidity than thorough in its nature. But three years have elapsed since that people, now so patient beneath the lash, rioted in the very drunkenness of license. The most unshackled liberty, the most expansive dreams of universal emancipation, and the wildest vagaries of speculation, were regarded as the rich fruit of American institutions. The sublime theories of antiquity's sages, the grandest conceptions of the practical modern statesman, and the fairest visions of the poet, were to be eclipsed by the unequalled combination of national greatness with individual liberty, of material prosperity and perfection in the arts and sciences with public spirit and pure patriotism, displayed in the triumphant career of the model republic.

"The ancients were accustomed, in the hour of their greatest prosperity, when fortune seemed to have showered all her gifts upon them, much to fear a sudden reverse. They sought by propitiating Nemesis to avert the penalty due to happiness beyond what is allotted to mortals. The Yankees, so far from making any such sacrifice or voluntary humiliation, waxed conceited and haughty. They were dictatorial and vain-glorious, confident in their wealth and power, and anxious to impose their own will on all mankind. They forced the South to resist their aggression and tyranny, and then, in the true spirit of vulgar despotism, resolved to revenge the insult which they deemed to have been offered to their sovereign will."

Never has God more signally vindicated His law, and glorified His great and awful name. It was in answer to the special entreaty of the chosen leader and legislator of His model republic, that God revealed himself in His character of "Governor of the nations." Though His anger had been provoked to destroy His chosen people, He ordered Moses to prepare two other tables of stone, upon which God wrote the words of the moral law which were on the first. "And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord: Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and trans-

gression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation."

These solemn words were first employed by God when He entered into national covenant with His people, and are repeated when, after apostasy, that national covenant is graciously renewed. They constitute a divine expression of God's providential method of punishing those nations among whom He has ordained a government and established His worship. They teach us that when such nations have rebelled against Him, though He will certainly, by His judgments, chasten and reform them, He will not utterly destroy. They are entirely distinct from, and even contrary to His dealings with individuals. (*See Ezek.* 33, *where this misapplication is elaborately argued and removed.*) And they have no reference to God's retributive justice for spiritual sins, *in a future state.* They are also very merciful, and very encouraging to a guilty and afflicted people—when God's judgments are abroad in their land—to learn righteousness, and to repent and return unto Him who alone can relieve and restore, by removing the evils He had visited upon them. They may be properly rendered in the following slight paraphrase: "The Lord, the Lord God; merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; who, while certainly punishing transgression and sin in those who are by no means guiltless, will not utterly destroy them and make them desolate; and delaying to visit with national judgments the iniquity of the fathers, until the times of their children, and their children's children, even to the third and fourth generation."*

* This rendering is in accordance with the original; and the context; and the prayer of Moses, in chapter 33; and with his remarkable prayer in

Liberty still endangered among us by the same maxims, and their practical results and influences. Our danger two-fold—external and internal; the latter the greater and more imminent—the price of our liberty.

How faithfully has a merciful and righteous God brought upon this favored land, *after three generations of unrepented and accumulated iniquity*, and abuse of privileges and prosperity, unparalleled in the history of the world, the fulfilment of this prophecy, promise, and warning! He is an atheist who does not see the connexion between the sin and the cause; who does not know God by the judgments he is now executing upon us, and who does not perceive in them a renewed proclamation of the forgotten law of God's moral and providential government—*that liberty has its price, and that that price must be paid*—either in a righteous and intelligent conformity of government to the nature of sinful man, the lessons of universal experience, and to the teachings of the law of God, or in a tyrannous usurpation, anarchy, and blood.

Let us hope that our enemies may not be utterly destroyed as a nation, but that they may have grace given them to turn away ungodliness from them, and to seek the Lord, who can, by His wonder-working providence, revive and restore them. But our great business is with ourselves. Our liberty, as provided for under the constitution of the United States, is lost—for ever lost. In any possible event, there is—there can be—no liberty for the South under the constitution and flag of the Union. It may be regarded as the policy of our enemies, and as immutably fixed as if already announced by proclamation of their imperial dic-

---

Numb. 14 : 18, where *it alone* will give propriety to the use of the passage; and with facts in the history of God's national judgments being so administered, as in the case of Manasseh, Hezekiah, Solomon, and the Canaanites; with the interpretation of Maimonides; of Poole, after others; of Geddes and the Comprehensive Bible; of Haldane, who is so accurate and cautious, &c.

tator, that, if subdued, the South will be reduced to provincial vassalage, until her territory can be emptied of its present race of freemen, and then colonized and absorbed, in re-constructed divisions, into the United States. But, thank God, our independent liberty is not lost, however much endangered, and however terrible the price which, for its restoration and peaceful independence under a confederate republic, God's righteous requisition may demand. In God's name, and by God's good guidance with us, we have set up our banners, and with Him as our chosen Vindicator, we have unfurled the purified flag of freedom to the admiring gaze of earth and heaven.

Our liberty, however, though not lost, is exposed to a double danger. It is threatened by our enemies, but it is in still greater danger from ourselves. Our enemies have come against us with fire and sword. Fury is in their heart, and the malevolence of desperate, reckless vengeance hurls at us whatever missiles of destruction Europe and America can supply. The fighting material of their own twenty millions, augmented by all that large bounties and the promise of coming plunder and unrestrained riot, can collect out of the most atheistical, anarchical, and unprincipled populations of Europe, come up against us. By land and by sea, by day and by night, through summer and through winter, and in every portion of our extensive territory, we are assailed by multitudes three times as great as we can muster in defence, and armed with engines of destruction unkown in any previous wars, and beyond all former power of resistance. They fight for conquest, and not for honor; avarice, and not ambition, sustains them in their irrepressible conflict. Humiliation, bankruptcy, repudiation, and the scorn and contempt of the world, goad them on in their frantic effort to make subjugation and success repay them for the loss of glory, the destruction of liberty, and national ruin. Restrained by no laws of war, or of nations, or of God, they make the end justify

the means, and might they sanctify as right, and their tenderest mercies are horrid cruelty. The extermination of the whole race, or its reduction to vassalage, are the only alternatives before us, if we are abandoned by God, or by our own perfidious pusillanimity to prefer subjection to that heroic, unconquerable, and long-suffering endurance and sacrifice, by which alone peaceful independence can be achieved. The scales hang trembling in the fearful balance, and while eternal justice holds them in its grasp, liberty or slavery await the speedy issues.*

Are we willing to pay the price of liberty? Let us in another article inquire what that price is, and how and when it must be paid.

---

* In a recent speech in London, the United States Minister, Adams, "enumerated the great things which had been accomplished since the rebellion broke out. The government at that time was almost disintegrated—now it is solid and firm—able to act with vigor and effect whenever and however it pleased. The people have rallied round the government and maintained the policy of the President. They have money, they have men, and they have ideas which they mean to establish on the only true and successful conclusion of the struggle."

ARTICLE II.

RATIONALISM FALSE AND UNREASONABLE.

[*Concluded.*]

But, before we close, we have a second fatal objection to urge against the religious philosophy that makes human reason the supreme arbiter in all questions which pertain to God and to man's relation to Him:

II. For it assumes that man is able to construct a philosophy of the Deity.

"Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Such was the question which Zophar the Naamathite, addressed to the man of Uz, and to which he did not doubt that the modesty of the patriarch's ignorance would give a negative reply; and such is the significant and comprehensive question to which rationalism must give an affirmative answer. One would think that it would shrink from so mighty an undertaking: but unchastened ignorance is insensible to its weakness, and bears a loftier front than genuine wisdom; the wise man is modest, the fool self-conceited and vain.

Rationalism is forced to maintain the possibility of metaphysical theology; it must therefore acknowledge that it is able to grasp the eternal One. The most cherished tenet of his creed constrains the rationalist to profess his ability to sound the depths of the Divine nature. Willing or unwilling, he must undertake that much; and he must not undertake it only; he must grapple with all the difficulties that he meets, and remove them, before he can evince the truth of his system, and require us to believe him. He boasts that he is competent to sit in judgment upon the merits of a supposed revelation: but how can he be competent, unless the materials of his criticism are drawn from

a thorough acquaintance with the nature of the Deity? If he is ignorant of that, he can not reject one single doctrine of a professed revelation, on the ground of its repugnance to reason.

And a partial knowledge of God will not be sufficient. If the rationalist would construct out of his own resources a theology that can be applied as an infallible test to the doctrines of a supposed revelation, his knowledge of the Divine Being must embrace a knowledge of all His attributes. For every doctrine presupposes in the Deity an attribute, upon which it rests for its justification before men. And unless we are thoroughly acquainted with all the attributes of God, how can we say that the doctrine which we question is not founded upon some of the attributes of which we are ignorant? The only exception that could arise, would be when contradictory doctrines were proposed, each one demanding our faith; yet even then, unless we understood the attribute on which one of them was based, we would be unable to say which of them should be rejected. Rationalism, therefore, is bound to exhibit the Deity in His comprehensive fulness, if its claims are well-founded; and when any one of its advocates opposes a truth of revealed religion, on the ground that it contradicts the judgments of the reason, he must convince us that reason has penetrated all the intricacies of the Divine nature. For instance; when Jowett, and Greg, and Mackay, repudiate the idea of a vicarious atonement, because, say they, it represents God as angry, and needing to be propitiated like some heathen divinity, their objections are worthless, unless they can show that the essential nature of God warrants them in making assertions so bold. When Socinus, Priestley, Newman, and Maurice, maintain that sins may be forgiven without the intervention of a substituted sacrifice, because penitence, and not satisfaction, is the condition on which we forgive our offending neighbors; they must prove that justice and forgiveness in God are the

same as justice and forgiveness in man; and that God's position as the supreme Lord and moral Governor of the universe, does not exempt him from those laws which bind us in dealing with creatures who are our equals. And when Kant confines all religious acts to the performance of moral duties, he must demonstrate that there is something in God inconsistent with the outpouring of praise, the expression of gratitude, the confession of sin, and the offering of petitions.

We have a right to exact thus much of a system, which clothes the independent conclusions of the human mind with full authority to decide upon the validity of either the whole or a part of any professed revelation. We therefore throw down the gauntlet to rationalism, and challenge it to make good its pretensions.

Now, if man is able to evolve a rational theology either from the facts of consciousness or from the deductions of reason, all its separate parts must be consistent, when viewed by themselves; and when united, they must blend into one harmonious whole. The existence of one attribute must involve no contradictions when considered by itself, neither must it conflict with the existence of another; and the actings of them all, when taken together, must present no appearance of discord or antagonism. If there is unity in the absolute nature of God, and that nature can unfold itself to the eye of man, the unity that belongs to the original must be reproduced in the likeness that philosophy is called upon to paint. It must not give us a picture indistinct and distorted, but one that is robed in the undimmed brightness of the Deity, and invested with the matchless symmetry of the all-perfect One. Our necessary conception of the Most High is that of a Being clothed with infinite perfection—perfection in His essence, His attributes, and His acts. And if that abstract conception can be elaborated into a system, the details of that system must not consist of jarring and opposing elements: they must be embodied

in propositions; and those propositions must vindicate their consistency and their truthfulness before the bar of the understanding.

See now the mighty task which philosophy undertakes and promises to perform. It is no less a work than to fathom the mysteries of the Godhead, and thereby construct a theology, which shall faithfully portray the absolute nature of the Deity, and present it to man freed from all imperfections and purged of all defects. Is it equal to the performance of the obligations which it has assumed? Can it redeem the promise that it has made? If it can, revelation must fall. If it cannot, whatever may be the fate of a supposed revelation, rationalism at least is shown to be a monstrous and audacious falsehood.

On the supposition that the knowledge of God lies within the range of our faculties, there are but two conceivable methods by which it could possibly be obtained. We might contend that there is a peculiar power in the soul, which intuitively takes cognizance of the Divine Being. In that case the perceptions would be immediate. Like the astronomer with his telescope, the soul would then be brought face to face with the grand object of its knowledge; the eternal verities of God's nature would burst in upon its vision without effort, even as the rising sun reveals itself to the open eye; and philosophy, instead of being a discoverer, would be nothing but a merely passive recipient of truth, and simply a recorder of the revelations which it had internally received. Or, we might argue that the soul of man is a miniature representation of the Deity, and that the nature of God is only an infinite expansion of our own. In that case we would attain to the knowledge of God by inferences drawn from a knowledge of ourselves.

But whether we adopt one method of procedure, or the other, the results at which we arrive must constitute a legitimate subject of criticism. In order to be intelligible, they must be presented in the form of propositions; and

propositions are true or false, consistent or contradictory, according to the verdict which is pronounced by the understanding. In both cases, therefore, every scheme of rational theology must subject itself to the examination of the intellect, and abide by its decisions. That is the bar before which it must always appear—the judgment-seat before which its pretensions must be tried; and if its statements should there be confuted, and its testimony jarring and antagonistic, it will surely be overwhelmed with shame and confusion of face.

Whether the rationalist contends that the soul has an immediate cognition of the Deity, or prefers to reason from the nature of the finite to that of the infinite, he must reach the conclusion that the Divine Being is the eternal, unconditioned, infinite First-cause. Such is the simplest and most comprehensive conception of the Deity that it is possible for the mind to form; and so long as we confine ourselves to the general terms in which it is expressed, and do not try to draw out and develope the ideas which they contain, we do not meet with any insurmountable difficulties. If all theology consisted in nothing but a general and exhaustive definition of God, rationalism might plausibly affirm that it had attained its end. It is true that a dim and hazy atmosphere would still hang over the whole field of its vision, and the mighty object after which it was searching, would be revealed only in shadowy and indistinct outline; but that dim outline of the Deity would exhibit no incongruity and present no contradictory elements.

It is obvious, however, that no theological system can enclose itself in language so general as that of the eternal, unconditioned, infinite First-cause. These terms may embody the living truth: but unless they can be elucidated in propositions which we can understand and demonstrate, they no more constitute theology, than the acorn constitutes the forest oak of which it is the germ. Unless they can be expanded into sentences consistent with each other, and

easy to be apprehended, rational theology is for man an impossibility. Let philosophy then, address itself to the work that is before it, and vindicate its claims to universal acceptance.

We predicate eternity of the Deity, and we cannot but do so. But what do we really mean by the term? We must not define it to be an endless successive duration. That would be to circumscribe the all-perfect One with the limitations of the creature, and it would contradict the idea that His existence is unrestricted by conditions. If we affirm it to be infinite duration without any succession, as we are obliged to do, we have a proposition whose terms are consistent, it is true, but still are intangible and absolutely unintelligible. If we endeavor to enlarge the grasp of our minds, and expand our conception of eternity into something that is positive and tangible, we break down in the effort, and are forced to resolve it into many periods indefinitely long. If one attempt does not convince us of the supreme folly of repeating our efforts, all succeeding attempts will be but a repetition of our first failure. It would seem, therefore, that, when we try to apprehend the Most High as the eternal God, so far from apprehending Him as He really exists, our finite capacity necessarily subjects His being to the laws of time. We must conceive of His existence as having no relation to time; and yet every attempt to mould that conception into a visible and appreciable form, destroys eternity, and resolves all duration into periods of time.

But that is not all. Time is just as certainly an entity as eternity. And since time is measured by succession, it must have begun with the created universe. But by an indestructible law of our minds, we are constrained to believe, that every act is bounded by an antecedent as well as by a subsequent period of duration. From this law we cannot exempt the act of creation. If, therefore, we are true to our constitution, we are driven to the conclusion that time

existed before the creation; and that is a palpable contradiction of what we know to be the case. If we fall back upon our knowledge, and, using the phraseology which we are obliged to employ, say that the period anterior to the creation was eternity, we again contradict ourselves, for eternity cannot be divided by a point of time; it can have no antecedence and sequence in its endless duration.

There is another idea with which we must grapple in constructing a metaphysical theology—that of the unconditioned. The Deity must be unconditioned, both in His being and in His attributes; for if He is conditioned by any thing, He is limited by that thing, and therefore is not infinite. Such is the abstract conception which philosophy forms, and the truthfulness of which it is compelled to exhibit, if it would substantiate its claims by giving us an image of the essential nature of God. But how soon it leads us into labyrinths from which we are unable to escape!

We cannot deny that the eternal God sustains one relation, at least, to the created universe. He is certainly connected with it as the cause with the effect; and that relation implies that His being is conditioned—conditioned now, although it was not always so. And thus a necessary conception is branded with falsehood by another conception equally necessary. If we endeavor to reconcile this antagonism, by saying that the relation of Creator to creature was voluntarily assumed, we plunge ourselves into a denial of the Creator's infinitude; for infinity implies absolute perfection, and forbids all addition to its boundless comprehensiveness.

We come now to the idea of the infinite, which is also fundamental to the system of rationalism. And when predicated of God, what does infinity mean, but the presence of all plenitude and the absence of all limitation? He must be unlimited in His being, as well as in the number and capacity of His attributes.

But if He is absolutely infinite in His being, as philosophy requires us to believe, He must be the sum of all existence. The universe, therefore, with its myriads of separate worlds, and all its spiritual and material organizations, is nothing more than a part of the Deity. To such a conclusion it must inevitably come; yet such a conclusion annihilates the premises from which it is logically deduced. It really denies the infinity of God; for the universe is composed of parts, and no aggregate of finite parts can constitute an infinite whole.

When we leave the infinity of God's being, and try to unfold the infinite number of His attributes, we enunciate propositions that destroy each other. Philosophy maintains that the number of His attributes is unlimited. But how can such an affirmation be compatible with the existence of separate attributes, as power, wisdom, and the like, which can never be united in a series absolutely without limit? Nor do we fare less badly, when we direct our attention to the infinite capacity of each one of the Divine attributes. Infinite justice, for example, must make an inexorable demand for the punishment of every transgressor; while infinite mercy will grant unconditional pardon to the most audacious rebel. Infinite power is equal to the production of all conceivable effects; yet it cannot do evil, for infinite purity forbids it.

It seems, therefore, that infinite attributes are limited in their operations by the existence of other infinite attributes. And thus it happens that the boundless nature of God, in passing through the limited faculties of the human mind, separates itself into jarring fragments, which no power of man's can unite into one coherent whole.

If we pass now to the idea of God as the great First-cause, we deny that He is the unconditioned One; for He is related to the universe as the cause to the effect. We also destroy the idea of His infinity; for infinity involves eternal perfection, and it cannot allow the assumption of

any relation whatever. If we then ascribe eternity to the universe, to save the idea of the infinite, we immediately exterminate our conception of a First-cause.

We may now see what philosophy can do towards constructing a metaphysical theology. We have allowed it an ample opportunity to display its boasted powers, and evince the justness of its pretensions. The conclusions at which it has arrived, are what we anticipated they would be. We grant that it has an abstract conception of the eternal, the unconditioned, the infinite First-cause. But if it affixes any meaning to the term, what is its eternity but a succession of indefinite periods of time? Its unconditioned projects itself into the form of the conditioned. Its infinite is divided, and becomes only a series of finite parts. The First-cause ceases to be a creator, and degenerates into a worker upon materials which He found ready to His hand. And when it mounts higher, and takes a more particular view of its necessary conceptions, and connects them together as they coexist in the nature of God, the product of its labors is a web of incongruous colors—a tissue of glaring contradictions and inexplicable absurdities; the eternal, the unconditioned, the infinite, and the First-cause, engaged in a merciless war that can only be ended by the destruction of them all.

Well may we ask, then, Can this be a faithful representation of the adorable God? If He is indeed the all-perfect One, and can be apprehended by mortals, the image upon which they gaze must reflect the beauty of its Divine original; it must be pervaded by a spirit of unity that will bind its component parts into one grand, coherent whole; and the man who looks upon it, mirrored in the depths of his own consciousness, should be able to paint its heavenly glories in more than an earthly coloring. But philosophy cannot do this. While it professes to find the likeness of God graven upon the human soul, it shows us a hideous picture, with its brightness tarnished and its features blurred

and distorted. Philosophy claims to have all the materials for constructing a rational theology; but it understands nothing of their real character; and when it attempts to unite them into a foundation upon which the structure may be raised, they are entirely destroyed by contact with each other.

We therefore conclude that human reason can never find out the essential nature of the Most High. Whenever it dares to raise the veil and intrude into the Holy of Holies, where Jehovah dwells in unclouded glory, the beauty and majesty of the Godhead withdraw; they refuse to be looked upon by mortal eye. The eternal verities of the Divine nature are mutilated and dislocated in their passage through the soul of man; and every attempt to gather them into a simple and homogeneous whole is a hopeless undertaking. Sooner might we collect the scattered fragments of the broken crystal, and fuse them into the sparkling gem that they once composed.

The conclusion which we have already reached by examining our necessary conceptions of the Deity, might also be reached if we view them in connexion with the limitations which are imposed by nature upon the human mind. Our faculties are finite in their capacities, and restricted in their range. Every distinct and positive idea is necessarily bounded. Every analysis that we make is really a limitation of the subject that we analyze. Every definition is a determination of the boundaries of the thing that we define. And every proposition that falls within the cognizance of the understanding, must consist of a predicate and a subject, which are both definable terms.

For us, therefore, who are conditioned by time, hemmed in by limitations, and acquainted with nothing that resembles a creative cause, there can be no positive conception of the eternal, the unconditioned, the infinite First-cause; and if we transcend our proper limits by attempting to grasp those mighty ideas, they elude our grasp; they lose

their boundless dimensions, and contract themselves within the narrow compass of man's finite consciousness. It cannot be otherwise. We may expand from day to day, and rise higher and higher, till we rival the intelligence of archangels themselves; but we can never escape from that inexorable law which makes it impossible for the finite to circumscribe the infinite. And when we mould our conceptions into the form of regular propositions, in order to compare them, and deduce other propositions which are their logical consequences, we meet with an instant and withering rebuke. For, in every proposition, the subject and the predicate must both be unlimited, or both limited; or one must be unlimited, and the other limited. If both are limited, the proposition that contains them may be legitimately criticised by the understanding; but it can give us no light upon the subject of the infinite. And if both terms are unlimited, or one is limited and the other unlimited, the mind can pass no judgment upon the truth or falsity of the propositions to which they belong; for every proposition that properly falls under the jurisdiction of the mind, must present terms that can be clearly defined and distinctly apprehended.

By two separate lines of argument, therefore, we reach the conclusion, that it is impossible for man to construct a philosophy of the Deity. If he makes the attempt regardless of the limitations of his faculties, he will find that he has overestimated his natural strength, and failed in the work that he undertook; and if he considers the boundaries that circumscribe his natural powers, he will at once perceive the futility of making the attempt. There is a hedge around him, which he cannot overleap—a gulf between himself and the infinite, which no human effort can bridge.

As long as rationalism holds to the existence of a personal God, it may be convicted of making false pretensions, when it claims the power to construct a metaphysical theol-

ogy. If it flies to downright atheism, there is an end, of course, to the possibility of any theology. If it adopts the scheme of Pantheism, and merges all the universe into modes of the Divine existence, its results are conflicting and altogether unsatisfactory. Pantheism even, can furnish no resting-place upon which philosophy can stand and construct a harmonious system of rational theology. Pantheism would obliterate the idea of a First-cause; but that idea is so deeply imbedded in the constitution of the human soul, that it refuses to be obliterated. It would confound eternity and time; it would carry succession into the depths of the distant past, and have us believe that eternity is nothing but an endless series of periods of duration. Such a statement we can never accept, for we know that no successive duration can ever measure that which must have been without any beginning at all. Pantheism has no place for the unconditioned in the system which it proposes for our acceptance. That conception is fundamental; but Pantheism disowns it in making all being but a development of the Deity according to a necessary and unchangeable law. And what becomes of the ideas of the finite and the infinite, in the system of the pantheist? If he believes in the finite, he contradicts the infinity of the Deity; for, since the universe is God, and is made up of finite parts, their sum cannot be infinite. If he prefers the infinite, and would sacrifice the finite, the finite will not allow itself to be sacrificed. It is indelibly stamped upon the mind; and whether he wills it or not, it will meet the pantheist in all his speculations, and incorporate itself into the terms of nearly all his propositions. If he endeavors to retain both the finite and the infinite, he involves himself in a contradiction.

Rationalism, therefore, even in the guise of Pantheism, can effect nothing in the department of theology. All its attempts will ever be abortive.

We might add another argument against the possibility of a rational theology. We might take the thunder of rationalists, and hurl it against the systems which they defend. Assuming, as we might do, that there can be but one philosophy of the infinite, we might demonstrate the impossibility of its construction from the differences between rationalists themselves. But we forbear. The discussion has been sufficiently protracted already.

It has been shown that rationalism, in denying the possibility of an external revelation, landed us in difficulties from which there was no escape. And since its truthfulness could not be established, without proving that a revelation was impossible, we were compelled to reject its pretensions as altogether unfounded. Nay more; having proved that a revelation was possible, we were enabled to take even higher ground, and demonstrate the positive falsity of every rationalistic scheme.

Our attention was next directed to an examination of another fundamental article in the creed of the rationalist—the ability of man to construct a metaphysical theology—when we proved beyond all doubt that the idea was preposterous and absurd. Thus again we were able to deny the truthfulness of all the theories that rationalism might advance.

If we now unite the two conclusions to which we have been conducted in the course of this discussion, and bring them both to bear at once upon the position of the rationalist, they will not only render it untenable, but will drive him to the position which the creed of the believer assigns to reason in matters of religion. If a revelation is possible, and a metaphysical theology is impossible, then reason can not be the supreme arbiter in questions of a theological kind. If man can construct no system of theology for himself, and God can reveal His will if He choose, it is plainly the duty of man to examine the evidences upon which a professed revelation is based, and not to subject its

doctrines to the censorship of reason. So far, therefore, from arriving at the conclusions of the rationalist, we are logically conducted to conclusions the very opposite. Instead of discarding evidence, and appealing to reason as a judge, we must reject the supreme authority of reason, and submit to the dictation of evidence.

With rationalism thus exhibited, and shown to be inconsistent with common sense and sound reason, it may well be asked, How did such a system originate, and grow, and spread so rapidly? The answer is two-fold, and easy to be given.

There seems to be a natural tendency in the human heart to run into infidelity. Every age, perhaps, has given birth to many whose opposition to the truths of revealed religion has plunged them into a denial of its divine origin. The distinctive doctrines of the Scriptures have always been repugnant to the unregenerate soul, and have always formed a target for the venomous hatred of the depraved heart. The inflexible justice of God; the guilt and helplessness of man; the certainty of eternal punishment; the necessity of an atonement; the impossibility of a sinner's renewal except by almighty power; these are truths against which sinful malice has ever loved to hurl its poisoned darts.

When rationalism, therefore, appears in a community where vital piety has yielded to a barren formalism, and makes its plausible appeal to an unsanctified soul, he is but too ready to embrace it; especially when it is sanctioned by great names and reckless thinkers, who have found it a safe asylum from the pangs of guilt and the anguish of remorse. Always opposed to the Bible, and predisposed to infidelity, he extends a warm and hearty welcome to a system that coincides with his wishes—a system that allows him to do as he likes, and to believe as he lists, by removing all apprehensions of a future retribution, and grounding him firmly in a total rejection of revealed religion. He may have some misgivings for a while; conscience may

occasionally make some friendly and pungent suggestions; but a little obstinacy will soon lull them all to sleep, and a deceitful heart rest satisfied with its own delusion. The man will then live on in perfect security, reaping the present reward of his sin in an utter unconsciousness of the deception which he has practised upon himself.

Another cause that may be assigned for the rise and progress of rationalism, is the pride of intellect with which our nature is cursed. The view which the Scriptures present of the condition of our race is humiliating to the last degree in all its aspects. The moral image of God is not the only glory of which the fall has deprived us. To lose that beyond the possibility of recovery, was to lose by far the noblest part of the heritage that God bequeathed us. But the work of ruin has gone farther than that. It embraces the intellect as well as the heart. The beauty and strength and vigor of the mind have been marred; its light has been dimmed, and a darkened understanding has followed upon the heels of moral depravity. The law of God, distinctly and beautifully impressed by His own finger upon the tablet of the soul, has not only lost its efficacy; it has been so disfigured and blurred by the tread of sin, that many of its brightest characters no unenlightened spirit can even discern. And the attributes of Jehovah, at one time so warmly appreciated by man, have ceased to be appreciated, it is true; but more than that, they have become so obscured by the clouds which sin has gathered about the mind, that no effort of reason can penetrate their dark folds and gaze upon the Deity, as He is revealed to the unfallen and the sinless.

This moral and intellectual weakness is recognised by the Scriptures as the ground on which a revelation is needed; and in making that revelation, they propose to supply the pressing wants of both the heart and the intellect. They are intended to renovate and to instruct; not only to re-stamp the image of God upon the soul, but also,

as conspiring to this end, to disclose to some extent the mighty and mysterious truths which centre in the being and attributes of God.

This humiliating aspect of our nature does not suit the ambitious wisdom of this world, which aspires too high. It makes man too dependent in the estimation of the carnal. It sinks him too low in the scale, and must therefore be rejected. It is much more gratifying to inordinate self-love, to maintain that man has an infallible guide within himself, and therefore needs no outward instructor. It is much more pleasing to an unsanctified reason, to make it the ultimate standard of appeal in questions of a theological kind. Rationalism, therefore, by raising reason to a position of dignity in which it is independent of God, appeals to one of the strongest of man's active principles. It fosters pride, and that of the loftiest kind—pride of intellect, which brooks no restraint and smiles with self-gratulation, when told that it can sweep its eye along the infinitude of God's nature, and measure at a glance its boundless length and breadth.

Why wonder, then, that rationalism should be popular, when the power of vital piety has ceased to exist? Encouraged by human depravity, and nurtured by pride of intellect, it is natural for it to number multitudes among its advocates. And when it ascends the pulpit, and by covert means endeavors to undermine the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures before men with fallen natures, it is not strange that many should mistake its false glare for the true light, and be misled by its pernicious errors.

But its end will come. Its doom is sealed. For a season inquirers may consult its oracle, and imbibe its falsehoods. But its heartless theology is too barren, too cold and lifeless to exert a lasting influence. Men may slumber for a time, as they did during the dark ages; but a new reformation will dawn upon the world, and the nations will awake to the emptiness of the dogmas which they have cherished.

Disgusted with the dreariness of the system which rationalism offers, they will cry out once more for the good old doctrines of the Bible, which alone are adapted to the wants of mankind. Like the prodigal son, they may now be wasting their substance in riotous living; but they will yet feel the gnawings of pinching hunger, and then they will return to their Father's house.

ARTICLE III.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEES OF CONFERENCE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA, ON THE SUBJECT OF A UNION BETWEEN THE TWO BODIES.

On the 29th of May, 1801, the General Assembly, at the instance of the General Association of Connecticut, adopted the celebrated "Plan of Union," which contained the following sentence:

"And provided the said standing committee of any church shall depute one of themselves to attend the Presbytery, he may have the same right to sit and act in the Presbytery as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church."

In the month of May, 1837, the General Assembly passed an "Act of Abrogation," in part as follows:

"But as the 'Plan of Union' adopted for the new settlements, in 1801, was originally an unconstitutional act on the part of that Assembly—these important standing rules having never been submitted to the Presbyteries—and as

they were totally destitute of authority as proceeding from the General Association of Connecticut, which is invested with no power to legislate in such cases, and especially to enact laws to regulate churches not within her limits; and as much confusion and irregularity have arisen from this unnatural and unconstitutional system of union; therefore it is resolved, that the Act of the Assembly of 1801, entitled a 'Plan of Union,' be, and the same is hereby abrogated."

There followed the "Disowning Acts," by which four Synods, those of the Western Reserve, Utica, Geneva, and Genesee, formed under this "Plan of Union, utterly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void from the beginning, are declared to be out of the ecclesiastical connexion of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and that they are not in form or in fact an integral portion of said church."

In the following year, these Synods appeared by their commissioners, and demanded seats in the next Assembly; and, on being rejected, were joined by other ministers, North and South, commissioners at the time, leaving the Assembly for the purpose, and formed another Assembly; thus inaugurating, of course, a separate Presbyterian Church.

In 1857, that new Assembly was divided by the secession of a body of Presbyterians in the Southern States, forming the present "United Synod;" and in 1861, the Old School Presbyterian Church, as it was commonly called, was also divided on the occasion of the war, and a distinct Assembly organized at Augusta. These are the grand facts that bring these churches together on Southern soil—the one, the Southern fragment of the Old School Church, driven to separation by lawless acts of their own Assembly in upholding a brutal usurpation; and the other, the Southern fragment of the New School Church, who went off with that body in 1838, though being, as all parties were even

then agreed, nearly all of them perfectly orthodox men, who went off without the slightest detrusion from the other side; who went off, not complained against, (for the most part,) but complaining; and who were complained against *after* they had gone off, chiefly for the act of going; who, in the eyes of most of us, would be relieving their chief mistake by coming back, or joining in with us in any mutually courteous way; but who, except in the instance of a few of peculiar doctrine, have been kept from doing so by objections to *us*—by objections (perhaps well-founded) to a formal individual examination, but also, to some extent, to our original "Disowning Acts," which all their experience in respect to Boards, and in respect to fanatic peculiarities of belief, have failed to reconcile them to; and which it is not necessary that they should be reconciled to, at this late day, as a preliminary ground on which we may come together.

The union of these churches, therefore, as far as the Old School are concerned, is a subject thoroughly prepared for in history. We never detruded this fragment. They never left us originally on any ground of an unconstitutional "Union." We never considered them heretical. We have at all times invited them back. And if an individual examination is undignified, or a "coming over" less mutually courteous than a "union" on independent terms, we have a technical right to do either; and if there are unorthodox men, we can make them no manner of promises, it being no more possible to abdicate our disciplinary rights, even though we knew of such cases beforehand, than for either "Old" or "New" to cast overboard the discipline of the church, or to embrace a different standard of "review" for one or another of the ministrations of the sanctuary.

We mean by that, a church notoriously sound, may, with perfect technical right, effect a union with one of a similar character; but if there be sporadic cases of unorthodox belief, the new church will not for a moment suspend her

government. The red blood running through her veins will seek the health of the distant members. No *argumentum ad verecundiam* will avail, even though it be said that we knew of these eccentric cases. Otherwise the union is a curse. If in growing larger, we perpetuate mistakes, let us forbear the union. Otherwise we are giving new citizens a franchise above the old; and if that should follow, we are inaugurating a "plan," some third of a century hence to be the *casus* of a new excision.

On the 1st of May, 1863, the Presbytery of East Hanover adopted an overture, asking the General Assembly "to take such steps as its wisdom may suggest, to bring about a union between the Old and New School Presbyterians in the Confederate States."

On the 13th, the General Assembly acceded to this request, and appointed a committee "to confer with a similar committee of the United Synod, touching the matter of a union between that body and the General Assembly."

On the 24th of July, the committees of the two church courts met in Lynchburg, and after a harmonious counsel, in which much that favored a union was made evident in the sentiments of both parties, unanimously adopted a report, which, if finally approved, will consummate this important union.

It is with a deep conviction that these brethren have committed one mistake; and that, with admirable harmony, and wonderful correctness in their statement of belief, and able gifts in inditing so sound a paper in so short a time as the first article in their intended report, nevertheless they should not present it to be adopted by the church, that we make it the subject of the present extended notice. No mortal men should have attempted such a "declaration" at a single sitting. No Presbyterian churchmen should have attempted it at all. We hope the General Assembly, with many expressions of respect for both committees, will quietly drop this *first article.* And we hope so for these

four reasons: First, that it is *unnecessary;* Second, that it is *unconstitutional;* Third, that it is *unprecedented;* and Fourth, that it will be *prejudicial to future discipline.*

We may say, for the sake of those who have not the paper before them, that the first article is one of six, (making up the original report,) that contains the whole of what the committees see fit to call their doctrinal "declaration." We may also add that the United Synod, from the nature of the case, as well as from statements repeatedly made to us, will be willing to acquiesce in such a contemplated arrangement; and also that the effect of foregoing that part will be to leave both bodies to the Confession of Faith, a symbol that they both adopt, without the medium of any ill-defined profession of belief to be improvised between it and the consciences of our ministers.

I. In pronouncing the article *unnecessary*, it becomes important, in the first place, to settle what it is. And we are reminded of that by a discrepance on the part of its advocates, in respect to this most important particular.

On the floor of the Virginia Synod, it was defended against the very line of argument that we here intend, by calling it a "written examination." In view of the impossibility that independent bodies should be catechised in parts, this was called a general examination; and Dr. Waddel has said, "every one who wishes to belong to this new united church, is required to signify his approval of this plan of union." Now how is this? Where, in the first place, is any arrangement made for giving in their approvals? On the contrary, nothing of the sort is spoken of. The paper is to be passed in open sessions, and would be passed in the teeth of a minority.* How, therefore, is this minority, or, in fact, any one who chooses to stay at

* "Article VI.—Whenever the above written plan of union shall have been adopted by the General Assembly and the United Synod, it shall be in full force."

home, or is not a delegate, or chooses to go out of the court, or protests against the whole procedure as a usurpation of the church, to be considered as having joined the new body? Is there not something incalculably loose in this part of the committee's operation? And if anything so enormous could be conceived as that even *in foro honoris*, Old School men ought to drop quietly out of the church, because they cannot adopt this paper, who is to bring this fact to their notice? Where are they to go? Is it not hard that an old churchman should find himself expelled, because he can not think well of this few afternoons' work of the Lynchburg committees? If he will not be, then there is no examination in the case. If he will be, then it is as strictly a SYMBOL as we can dream of in any criterion we could erect.

And the committee virtually give in to this, by calling it a "declaration" of belief and a "Doctrinal Basis of Union." And in fact, Dr. Dabney, one drafter of the paper, calls it, in the "Southern Presbyterian,"* "a new formula," appeals as a precedent to "the days of Arius and the Nicene Creed," and speaks of "language adjusted with special reference to the existing differences, so that its acceptance will be a practical test of opinion."

Whatever it may be called, therefore, it is certainly an attempt at a test, and that test is either nothing, or else a thing to be enforced in adhesions to the new organization.

Now how is this necessary?

Dr. Waddel tells us:† "If we had dispensed with the rule, (*i. e.* of examination,) and then laid down no declaration of principles setting forth the true interpretation of our standards, in that case, there would have been grounds of apprehension lest unsound men might creep in among us, and then, if arraigned, they would have had us at a disadvantage.

---

* November 19, 1863.

† Letter from Lynchburg.

They would be able to say, I preached the doctrines of the Confession before this union, just as I do now, and you admitted me. I have a right to complain that you have entrapped me, and after receiving me into your pale, knowing my unsoundness, as you call it, you now arraign me for it. But after the plain declaration of principles laid down by the committee, no man can plead this against us."

The exact motive therefore—and that of the committee, we suppose, for Dr. Waddel had just left its sittings—was to give us a *right*, whether in the eye of order or taste, it matters not which, to discipline any preconceived case of error. Now, we boldly protest against any such idea. We declare the paper an evil on this very account, and denounce it, if it even seems the record of any such even half-entertained idea. We are opposed to any statement of our rights to discipline, because we cannot affect them. We cannot abolish them even if we would. We cannot increase them. The union clean and clear, without any breath on the judgments of the courts, is all that we can conceive. And if to-morrow the eye of the church falls on error, it can view it in no new light; else we are not Presbyterians. We must alter our constitution, or else the ministers we join ourselves to, under this new proposal, are orthodox men; or else we are unfair in our discipline, unless we deal with them precisely as with ourselves.

The other statement, therefore, that the method has been pretended in former times of adopting our symbols "for substance of doctrine," and to put an end to that, some more defined expression is necessary, we protest against on the same account. We will not sanction an error by providing against it. We will not countenance an immoral step which our whole church is known to have inveighed against, and which no man of handsome impulse, to say nothing of conscience, will repeat against us in this stage of our history, by supplying a test, as though distinctly to acknowledge that the other was unclear. We will not feed

the error. For what is the proof that our "new formula" will be any better treated? And which is wiser, our old Confession, digested after careful years, without even a word (and we are opposed to any) setting forth our horror of this "*substance of doctrine*," or an ancillary work done in a few nights of a stay at Lynchburg; done ably, but imperfectly, as such work must necessarily be; and recording itself in the history of the times as done to abate a pretext; as though that pretext could not be turned against itself; and as though providing against it, were not *per se* disrespectful to the church; disrespectful to the creed; disrespectful to their own work, which must feel the edge of just such an admitted objection; disrespectful to orthodox men, who are to have sent out to them by a majority vote the expressions of a test most extemporaneously prepared; and above all, disrespectful to the United Synod, if they be *ipso facto* entitled to the respect of being considered at the very time worthy of the union with the great body (at the South) of Presbyterian believers?

If therefore, this test *would hold*, we would regard it by all manner of means as singularly unnecessary.

II. But then, secondly, it will not hold. We mean by that it is *unconstitutional.*

Admit, for the sake of argument, that it is not a creed, and not a symbol; though that is a singular position. For even if it were a "written examination," (the very lowest ground,) it would remain on record; and is *in thesi* an established test. If it has not the creed feature, and that, as a codicil, or a thing over and on the top of the old Confession, (as Dr. Dabney expresses it, "a drawing up on the points where difference is suspected, a new formula,") we would like exactly to know what a creed feature is. But whether it be a creed or no, it is a "rule," loosely administered, it is true, or, as we shall show under the last head, not really capable of being administered at all; nevertheless an attempted "rule;" and our Book shows that nothing of

the nature of a constitutional rule is to be imposed upon the church, without the approval of at least a majority of all the Presbyteries.

Now, it may be said that this is *not* a rule enforced upon the church; and yet it *is*, beyond all question, in that part of its operation that extends to our own body. That we might have a right to treat with the United Synod, and ask *them* some questions in respect to their notions of doctrine, and to print the answers, (to give the most favorable construction of the case,) might be more plausibly insisted; but that a General Assembly should attempt a test upon itself; nay, to merge itself into a new body made up of the old and the United Synod; and that, on the basis of a formula prepared at a single sitting, its old ministers must either adhere or retire; is an act so presumptuously invalid that we wonder it could have been entertained by our very most intelligent Presbyterians.

III. We need not say that it is *unprecedented.* If it were *not*, it would not be positive proof; but that it is, should make these committees consider before they even report such a thing to their Assemblies.

An Assembly may utter a *testimony* just as a session may. It may *reprove*, and *rebuke*, and *exhort*, and, of course, do this in the matter of doctrine. It may print *homilies*, and make them, of course, as didactic as it please. It may do any thing that an individual preacher may, and yet is liable to be thundered against by another General Assembly, if, like an individual preacher, it errs from the truth. Hence all those papers that Dr. Dabney has adduced. They are pastorals, like his own sermons on Sunday morning. There are stronger ones in 1818 and 1839, which he has not adduced. They are acts and testimonies of irresponsible bodies of men, papers of Synods, in respect to which bodies there is no pretension of a power to found a test; but in no case, in the whole history of the continent, nor, as we are firmly convinced, of any other kirk or continent,

any act like that which, in those nights of July, those able committees were preparing for our Presbyterian Assemblies.

They remind one of those exquisite machines of Babbage, which, for ten million times, or, if you please, for ten thousand years, will move without the slightest aberration, and yet which, from some strange proclivity of their nature, will make just for once, and in the most unaccountable and sudden way, the greatest that can be possibly imagined.

We beg these brethren to make another report. This is a very able one, and sound to an extent we would not have been able to conceive. That a man should be able to put his pen to paper, and prepare such a test in a few excited hours, is an intellectual feat. But then, feats are not constitutions. Creeds are one thing, and high testimonies to the faith, even by assemblies, quite another. Those profounder things are impossibles at a sudden birth. And therefore, though we defend the paper, and as Virginians would be rather proud of it, yet it does fall into erroneous statement. It is not true that "the sinner has power of any kind for the performance of duty." It is not true that the atonement "leaves no other obstacle under the Gospel, save the enmity and unbelief of those who voluntarily reject it." It is not happy to talk of the "*righteousness of His sufferings* and obedience (as) is the sole ground for which God pardoneth all their sins." If Dr. Baxter said any of these things, or even the apostle Paul, in his uninspired moments, it makes it all the more dangerous. They are true in a certain tortuous and very side sense. But that is not the way we want a symbol. We understand that one of these very committee men has published in a pamphlet that a creed ought to be produced as the fruit of a many-sided and multitudinous debating of its principles.

IV. But if this test were even taken out of the Bible, with altered language, we should consider it *prejudicial to future discipline.*

For understand: there is no grip in it. It has in some parts an edge that would arrest the finest heretic; but it can arrest nothing. Its very appearance on the walls of Zion shows that we have daubed these for the very purpose to hide some imagined difficulty. But as it is perfectly invalid, it really can do no strengthening service. It shows that we gave way to a pretext; that we felt scared from our rest by the ghost of "substance of doctrine;" that we felt in this recentest courtship, we were conceding to the bride some shamefacedness in respect to discipline, but when that awkwardness was supposed to be revealed, the new garment has done nothing to cover it. The new basis is as perfectly without force as a blank parchment could possibly be made.

But then, ever so much without force, it is powerful on the side of others. As an appeal to honor, it is omnipotent. We must undo the union, or abide by this paper, when we have once passed it. And hence, as a sound paper, all it amounts to is, we must take the heretic on both Confessions. While he stands upon the new, we must battle with him on the basis of honor. When, after long worry, we have beaten him out of it, he has nothing to do but to claim the old. It annuls discipline. In other words, it gives the heretic the right of two Confessions, while we can appeal only to one. And if in those unwary passages, he takes refuge in the thought that the sinner has *some* power to perform his duty, we can not, after long debate, bring against him its stronger clauses without his appealing from the whole, and taking refuge, where he has a right, under the shadow of the old Confession.

We believe, therefore, that the Assembly, after a most cordial expression about the ability and good spirit shown in Lynchburg, will take interest in this paper in proving how nearly agreed those leading gentlemen were; will welcome the idea of a naked and cordial union; will utter nothing about the right of the new aggregated body to dis-

cipline heretics, from the *necessity* of such a right, and from the impossibility of any Assembly deciding for or against it; will utter nothing about "substance of doctrine," because all parties know our views about such a pretext; and therefore, founding no test themselves, they will allow none from the committee, but will gently demit the first article of their report, unless it be that the two committees, as would be infinitely better, see cause to withhold that part themselves.

Meanwhile the coalescing of Presbyterians may go on, perhaps, a great deal further. And without any new trammelling expedients or unlawful tests that must be inexorably maintained, there may be a great wholesome Presbyterian body at the South, not committed inviolably to any plans, or superinduced perpetual pledges of any sort, but partaking the old evangelical life, and submitting with no peculiarity of test to the old Presbyterian authority.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PROPOSED PLAN OF UNION BETWEEN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED SYNOD OF THE SOUTH.

In compliance with an overture from the Presbytery of East Hanover, the last General Assembly appointed a committee to confer with any similar committee of the United Synod, touching a formal union between these bodies. The two committees accordingly held a conference at Lynchburg, Va., in the month of July last; and agreed

upon a paper which, when adopted by the Assembly and the Synod, should consummate the proposed union. The report of this conference was immediately published, under the authority of the two committees, "to prevent public misapprehension," and for "the information of Presbyteries and Synods, upon which to ground any proceedings they may deem proper." It may be supposed, therefore, to be in the possession of all who shall honor this article with a perusal; thus obviating the necessity of its reproduction in our pages, which unfortunately our want of space would in any case forbid. In our criticism of this document, we shall be careful, however, to quote fully the passages to which we may have occasion to refer, that the reader may judge of the fairness and validity of the strictures adventured.

Before commencing this unwelcome task, two preliminary remarks must be indulged upon the history of this paper since the time of its adoption by the committees of conference, evincing a degree of unfairness on the part of its advocates of which we may justly complain. Immediately upon the publication of the report, an earnest request was preferred that no discussion of its contents should be admitted into the newspapers of the church; a prohibition which seemed to close the door against all who might desire a solution of their doubts respecting the principles of so important a paper. We construed this request, at the time, not as an attempt to forestall investigation, but simply to postpone it until the report should be brought, as required, before the General Assembly at its next meeting. The design of our brethren we judged to be simply an adjournment of the whole matter in its present inchoate state; with a view to carry the discussion over from the public press, where it could terminate in no tangible result, to the ecclesiastical court to which it properly belonged, and where it would end at once in a practical decision. We could see a manifest advantage in thus preserving the church from all agitation, until the moment when that agitation would

instantly be calmed by a vote which would reveal the mind of the whole church. It appeared therefore, to us, *pro tanto*, a pledge that the subject should sleep until it could be fully and fairly ventilated upon the Assembly's floor. What then was our surprise to learn that no efforts were spared to bring this report, not only unapproved by the Assembly, but not even as yet submitted to that body, before some of our largest and most influential synods?—thus committing no small portion of the church to its support six months antecedently to the assembling of the court which alone has jurisdiction over it. It seems to us that it would have been far more graceful to allow the Assembly's committee time to submit, according to its instructions, the report of its labors, and thus to take the sense of the collective church, rather than virtually to wrest the matter out of the Assembly's hand, and to make up the verdict of the church in detail. And what shall be said of the fairness of binding over to silence all dissentients, (which silence, by the way, has been quietly assumed as acquiescence in the proposed union,) while its advocates employ the interval in so shaping public opinion through the subordinate courts, that to the General Assembly itself is left only the poor office of registering the final decision? Connected with this should be noticed the extreme sensitiveness to even the gentlest criticism, manifested by some of the framers of this report. A few brief and courteous exceptions to the phraseology of that instrument have been received with an impatience falling just one degree below positive resentment—the last infirmity we should have attributed to leading statesmen in the church. This petulance towards old and tried confederates looks strange by the side of the new-born love glowing towards new-found allies, and somewhat abates our admiration so confidently challenged for the amiable conference at Lynchburg. We hope all this may not indicate a settled purpose to force this union by a predetermined method, whatever grief may be occasioned those by whom it is disapproved.

But this naturally introduces our second ground of complaint, the disposition to treat this as a local question upon which only certain portions of the church need be consulted. Since the United Synod happens to be distributed chiefly in Virginia, Tennessee, and North Mississippi, it is intimated that any expression of opinion from other quarters will be considered obtrusive and indelicate. If those who enjoy a daily intercourse with their New School brethren are satisfied of their orthodoxy, and earnestly desire a formal union, the hesitation of others, who do not possess equal facilities for knowing, must be ascribed to the remains of party zeal which has survived the interval of five and twenty years since the disruption in 1837. But this assumption, we may as well say frankly in the outset, will not be tolerated for a moment. The fusion of a body like the United Synod into our Assembly, will affect the complexion and fix the character of the entire church through generations to come. It is, therefore, preëminently a question of public policy; which they at least are not unfitted to determine, who happen to be free from the bias of local interests and friendships. Principles, too, may be involved in the manner by which the union is effected, in which, beyond dispute, all portions of the church have an equal interest. We are not disposed, therefore, to be ruled out of the court under the cry of non-intrusion; feeling that we owe a sacred duty to the church, and her blessed Head, to see the union accomplished by a right method, if it be accomplished at all.

We proceed now with our objections to the Basis of Union proposed by the committees at Lynchburg: the first of which is founded upon the following preamble of the report:

"The General Assembly and the United Synod of the Presbyterian Churches in the Confederate States of America, holding the same system of doctrines and church order, and believing that their union

will glorify God by promoting peace, removing the dishonor done to religion by former separations, and increasing their ability for the edification of the body of Christ, do agree to unite."

Now, what precisely is meant by the clause, "*removing the dishonor done to religion by former separations?*" The reference evidently is to the schism of 1837, for no other has any thing to do with the objects of this paper. Does the committee intend this as a constructive repudiation of what are known as the Reform Measures of 1837, and of the acts and testimonies of that day, which have been steadily affirmed by the Church to the present hour? Dr. Dabney, in his elaborate defence of the committee's report, disclaims this in the most express terms:

"It is objected that when we propose the Assembly shall say, the 'union will remove the dishonor done to religion by former separations,' we imply that the men and principles of 1837 were dishonorable to religion. The only things fairly implied are, that there were separations, that those separations did dishonor religion, (it does not say which was the guilty side in them,) and that the Assembly can, by re-union, aid in removing that dishonor. Does the editor of the *Southern Presbyterian* remember how prelatists mocked at Presbyterianism for its stormy strifes, and went about proselyting our weaker members, with the invitation into their "peaceful and harmonious" fold? Has he forgotten how the decent men of the world even were scandalized by the unseemly heats exhibited by some on both sides? Has he forgotten the mourning of the purest and best, the Baxters, the Alexanders, the Rices, on the old side itself, over the dishonor of religion? A right cause may be advocated in a wrong spirit; and he would be a bold man indeed, who would affirm that none of us have been guilty of that error. Therefore we should be willing to confess that part of the guilt as ours."

According to this, then, "the dishonor to religion" consisted not in the principles we then avowed, and which we may be supposed still to cherish, but in the acrimonious spirit with which the controversy was conducted. Even

with this important modification of the language of the report, it is a question whether the Assembly is authorized to pronounce thus judicially upon the motives and temper of men, many of whom have already gone to render their account to Him whose sole prerogative it is to search the heart. But unfortunately this is not what the clause affirms, which attributes the dishonor to the *separation itself*, and not to its *separable accidents*. The question is not what construction can be forced upon the words, but what will be their plain and obvious import to those who shall read the record as a matter of history, and who will not enjoy the benefit of the subtle commentary which will then have been long since buried in the files of the *Southern Presbyterian* office. We are constrained to say, that whatever may have been the secret meaning in the hearts of the committee, the language is a virtual abjuration of all the principles so earnestly contended for in 1837. Should the Assembly of 1864 be prepared for this, then we object to its being done covertly by an indirection. If we sinned against our New School brethren in the measures which led to that painful schism, let us have the magnanimity to confess it openly. Instead of an equivocal clause which throws the guilt upon both parties, and leaves each free under a species of mental reservation to take as much or as little as it may please, let us with Christian frankness implore pardon of God and forgiveness of our brethren, for an atrocious wrong which has been persisted in through a quarter of a century. But we do not believe that a single presbyter in the church recedes from the position taken in 1837. As for ourselves, so far from regarding that separation a dishonor to religion, we account it one of the most beneficent and glorious reforms which grace the annals of the church. It not only saved the Old School from rapid declension into error, but if there has been, as alleged, a gradual approximation of the New School to real orthodoxy, it is due under God to the faithful testimonies of that day

which aroused them in time to recoil from the frightful abyss into which they were about to plunge. We cannot, therefore, consent to the adoption of any language, the ambiguity of which will allow the possible inference that we ignore or repudiate principles and measures for which the church should still offer her thanksgivings unto God; much less the language of this preamble, which, in its obvious import, directly impeaches and disowns them.

We have lying before us, a copy of the *Christian Observer*, the representative of the United Synod, bearing date February 13, 1862, which may possibly show how this ambiguous clause will be interpreted by certain parties in the future. In an article under the well known signature of A. H. H. B., the writer thus graciously distinguishes between the Southern Assembly, and the Old Assembly from which it seceded, touching this very matter:

"But as our Southern Old School brethren have abandoned the Assembly, whose violent and unconstitutional acts in 1837 led to the division of the Church, North and South, they cannot be held responsible for those acts. As individuals our brethren may approve of the principles involved in those acts, still the cause of the division of the church was the endorsement by the Assembly of these principles; and until the Southern Old School Assembly declare their adhesion to these principles, we shall not be justified in regarding them as, in part, the *basis* on which they rest their church. It is true, Dr. Thornwell said, in the Augusta Assembly, 'the Assembly of 1837 is to all intents this Assembly. We stand by its declarations.' If this sentiment should be sanctioned by the Southern Old School Assembly, then we say emphatically, there can be no union between that body and the United Synod. * * * We wish Dr. Thornwell and his brethren distinctly to understand, that we have now as deep an abhorrence of this principle, involved in the act of 1837, as we had in 1839, when we separated from Southern brethren whom we loved, and with whom, under other circumstances, it would have been a privilege to have been united until death. We do not know of a single minister in connexion with the United Synod who has changed his views on

this subject. * * * We do not ask our Southern brethren to endorse our interpretation of these acts. Nor do we ask their Assembly *formally* to announce it as a fundamental principle in their church government, that no judicatory of the church can *for any cause*, by an act of legislation, constitutionally condemn or exclude from the church, ministers or private members, without a process of trial, such as is prescribed in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. We did require of the Old Assembly in 1858, the declaration of this latter principle as indispensable to a union with them; and we did so because we regarded that Assembly as the successor of the Assembly of 1837, which, in our judgment, had most palpably trampled upon the great constitutional and moral right of a trial before condemnation. But as our Southern Old School brethren are confessedly seceders from their Assembly, they cannot be held responsible for the exscinding acts of 1837."

These remarkable sentences, which have at least the merit of being unambiguous, plainly show how the measures of 1837 are still regarded by our New School brethren. The writer declares, on behalf of the entire body to which he belongs, and the statement has been on record without contradiction, so far as we know, for two years, that no union could be formed with us if we were considered as endorsing these measures. In the overtures for union in 1858, their distinct repudiation was made an indispensable condition; and if the same demand is not made of us, it is because, by an amusing fiction, our ecclesiastical identity has been lost, and we are graciously discharged from all responsibility in the premises. Whatever individuals may think, so long as our Assembly shall abstain from formally re-affirming these obnoxious principles, it will enjoy an imputed innocence, by virtue of which the United Synod may unite with us without the sacrifice of dignity or principle. In this state of case our respected committee at Lychburg do what? Correct this error by re-affirming the reform measures of 1837? They were not desired to do that—no; but in the sixth line of the preamble of their report they

call upon the Assembly to repudiate and anathematize the separation, which was the fruit of these measures which are so bitterly reviled. It seems to us that our committee might have had the grace to refrain from aspersing our glorious past; and especially that with those published declarations from a representative man of the United Synod before their eyes, they would have abstained from placing upon the lips of the Assembly any constructive repudiation of principles still dear to the heart of the church. In vain does the committee protest, such was not our meaning. Their report goes upon the record, but not their commentary; and we begin to see the value of a test paper which requires explanation even in its preamble, and where explanations thicken upon us at every step of our advance. In vain Dr. Dabney exclaims, at Charlotte, as did Dr. Thornwell, at Augusta, "the Assembly of 1837 is to all intents this Assembly—we stand by its declarations." Dr. Boyd replies, You are only individuals; but your Assembly has formally denounced the schism of 1837 as a dishonor to religion, which is as strong a renunciation of that grand reform as I could myself desire. We sincerely hope, if this unfortunate report of the committee should be adopted by the Assembly, a protest may be so framed as to require that venerable body to define its relations to the acts of 1837 so seriously compromised in this ambiguous clause.

The cancelling of a single line will, however, remove this difficulty. But our next objection is interwoven with the whole texture of the report, in that it virtually impeaches the orthodoxy of our own church in the imputation of errors which she is required to disown. There are good reasons why the doctrinal soundness of the United Synod should be called in question, and why, perhaps, they should desire to purge themselves of these suspicions. It is notorious that doctrinal differences lay at the bottom of the separation in 1837. The Old School Assembly felt constrained to testify, in the most emphatic manner, against the

heresies of Barnes, Beman, Duffield, and others, which were rapidly infecting the church; and so imminent was the peril that, at one time, it was doubtful whether the orthodox or the heretical party would obtain the ascendency. It is notorious, too, that the body now known as the United Synod voluntarily went out from us, and affiliated through twenty years with these errorists; separating at last from them, not upon doctrinal grounds, but upon a political question, and not until the fanatical fury of Northern radicals no longer permitted them a seat in their ecclesiastical councils. We are not unmindful of the defence set up on behalf of this procedure; that the southern wing of the New School were seduced by their sympathy for those whom they regarded as unjustly and unconstitutionally dealt with in what are known as the Exscinding Acts, and that they were never accused of participation in the heresies charged upon other portions of their body. We do not intend to discuss here the wisdom or equity of these same Exscinding Acts, since this is not at all necessary to the matter now in hand. Even admitting all that has been said and written against them, what are we to think of the doctrinal purity of men who, in their incomparable zeal for a mere constitutional safeguard or ecclesiastical right, are willing to see the truth of God turned into a lie, and the whole Gospel made of none effect through human traditions? Admitting the whole force of their defence, it is surely a strange insensibility to the preciousness of divine truth, which can induce them to sacrifice this rather than a principle, however important in itself considered, of their ecclesiastical constitution. They did prefer to homologate with men who subverted the atonement of Christ and the offices of the Holy Spirit, rather than with men the extent of whose crime, by their own showing, was simply the exercise of ecclesiastical tyranny. A conscience so exquisitely tender that it could not participate in the sin of the latter, ought to have shrunk from the guilt of the former. Had the zeal

of the United Synod been half as great for the gospel of the grace of God as for one single principle in church government, they would have withdrawn from both schools, Old and New; and would not now be required to explain the substantial difference between indifference to truth and the rejection of it. As it is, they must not complain of being judged of by the company they have kept.

It is moreover a suspicious fact, that the United Synod has never repudiated the partial and unsatisfactory subscription to the standards of the Church, which was one of the original grounds of offence against the New School party, with whom they have chosen to be identified. On the contrary, at their first meeting in 1858, they append to the declaration of their adherence to the Confession of Faith, a supplementary explanation which seems to us to recognise and to embody the fatal reservation of a subscription for "substance of doctrine." The reader may judge of the correctness of this inference by carefully weighing the import of their own language:

"In thus adopting the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, we adopt it in the sense in which we believe the Fathers of the American Church received it, to wit: not as requiring an agreement in sentiment with every opinion expressed in said Confession, but a belief in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and in the doctrines which distinguish the Calvinistic system from the Pelagian, Socinian, Arminian, and other systems of theology. This system we understand to include the following doctrines, viz: the trinity, the incarnation and supreme deity of Christ, the fall and original sin, atonement, justification by faith, personal election, effectual calling, perseverance of the saints, eternal happiness of the righteous, and eternal punishment of the wicked. Whilst various modes of stating and explaining these truths may be adopted, yet when they are received according to the usual way of interpreting language, and as they have been understood by the great body of the Presbyterian Church in this country, from the period of the adoption of the Westminster Confession in 1729, to the present day, the requi-

sitions of the Confession are complied with, and all such persons are to be regarded as having received as their doctrinal creed, this system of doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures."

Observe, then, that we have not here a subscription to the Confession *simpliciter*, but a subscription with qualifying and restrictive clauses, couched in language far too indefinite to serve the purpose of a test. There is the same equivocation with the words "system of doctrine" which vitiated the subscription of New School men in 1837, and created such trouble in determining what was accepted and what was renounced. It is a subscription which does not bind to an agreement in all that the Confession contains, but only in certain fundamental doctrines, the reception of which is all that is meant by the phrase "system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." Then, apart from this restricted adoption, the Confession is not to be interpreted according to the literal and obvious import of its own terms, but according to a certain sense in which these parties *believe* it to be received by the body of the church; so that the appeal evermore lies from the Confession to this general sense of the church in whatever way it may be collected, instead of ascertaining the sense of the church by reference at once to its acknowledged symbols. Then, too, whilst the Confession is admitted as discriminating against Pelagians, Arminians, and Socinians, there is a studied silence in reference to the very forms of error prevalent in the New School body, except as these may be embraced in the very comprehensive clause, "and other systems of theology." Why, since the enunciation was commenced at all, in order to show in what sense the Confession was adopted, does the United Synod stop at the mention of these antiquated and well-defined heresies, and preserve an ominous silence in regard to Hopkinsians, Taylorites, &c., with whom they have been supposed more or less to sympathize? The specification of certain important doctrines

appears at first sight candid and fair; but unfortunately, writers of the class to which Dr. Beman belongs, profess to recognise these, for example, that of the atonement, as the doctrines both of the Confession and of the Bible, whilst by their interpretation we may truly complain, in the language of Mary, "they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." What we desire of these brethren is a plain, straightforward adoption of the Church standards, in their simple and obvious import, without equivocation or reservation of any sort. This is the way in which we have subscribed them, and which we require of all intrants into the sacred office. This will go further to remove our suspicions than the most elaborate attempts to fence round and to define their assent, or the best balanced basis of union which can be drawn up by joint committees of conference.

We do not mean by the foregoing remarks to affirm that the United Synod, as a body, is unsound in doctrine. Against one or two of their leading men, there is a written record to be disposed of, and of them we may have to speak in the sequel. But as our Virginia brethren have undertaken to vouch for the orthodoxy of the body, we are disposed to defer to their testimony, and to hope that what they believe in regard to them is true. But we have succeeded in showing the grounds upon which that orthodoxy has been at least suspected. Now the feature that offends us in the proposed plan of union, is that it places the Old School church upon identically the same footing of suspicion with the New School, and requires the same purgation of the one that it requires of the other. The framers of the report indignantly repel the suggestion of its being a compromise between the parties negotiating. But it is too patent upon the face of the paper, to be overlooked or denied. There is an antithesis pervading the entire document, a balancing of one view against another, which points to the two parties who are to adopt the instrument as plainly

as though it were written, this is for you, and that in turn is for you. Both drink alternately of the water of jealousy, and with their hands raised to heaven purge themselves of alternate errors. Both swear, indeed, in identical terms; but in each case, the oath with one is an absolute form, and with the other an absolute reality. Thus, in the section on imputation, the New Schoolman affirms Adam's posterity to be judicially condemned on account of his first sin, and means something by it, for he was supposed before to doubt or to deny it: the Old Schoolman affirms it too, and the world knows that he is called to do so only out of complaisance to his suspected brother, for whom the ordeal was really designed. Again, the New Schoolman declares this imputed guilt to be only obligation to punishment, and not the sinfulness of the act itself, and can scarcely keep his countenance in the solemn farce of disclaiming a dogma which no one ever dreamed of charging upon him; while his more serious neighbor feels the accusation of the test which requires him to deny that imputation involves a transfer of personal character. When, again, the New Side declares the sinner to have wholly lost all ability of will to choose spiritual good for its own sake, the Old Side responds yet so that the sinner be not stripped of his moral agency and accountableness; and thus the impartial test touches with the point of a needle the alleged weakness of both. Indeed, were it not for the solemnity of the subjects involved, one might smile at the ingenuity of the committee to find in every case the necessary makeweight that shall keep the balance even. Thus, when the suspected New Light has confessed the penal character of Christ's sufferings, affording a vicarious yet true satisfaction to the justice of God, where shall an offset be found, if that poor forlorn Gethsemane doctrine be not hunted out of its obscurity—"which," as Dr. Hodge testifies, "is not found in any confession of the Protestant churches, nor in the writings of any standard theologian, nor in the recognised authorities

of any church of which we have any knowledge." Accordingly this lost, stray theory, cast as a waif upon the theological world, without a patron or a friend, is trumped up simply that the General Assembly may be brought to the confessional in some form; and so she gravely testifies that the drops of Christ's blood were not weighed in the scales of a commercial transaction. Now, greatly as we may admire the generous compassion of our brethren of the committee for the shame which must attend the confessions of a suspected party, we doubt whether this sentiment would authorize the General Assembly in staining the reputation of a church hitherto immaculate in this respect, merely to afford them company in passing through the trial. Were it a question of mere sympathy, we would cheerfully consent to alleviate the humiliation of our New School brethren; but it is a question rather of simple justice to our own body, whether by voluntary impeachment we are to soil the garments of the Church, the bride, the Lamb's wife. We are free to say that we are prepared to spare them the humiliation of any confession, rather than compel a church to share it with them, whose glory it has ever been to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

Our third objection to the proposed doctrinal basis, is more fundamental, and is drawn from the quasi-symbolic character it must necessarily assume. It is a declaration drawn up by two parties, in order to show their hearty agreement and to remove suspicions and offences. Now, what does the Confession of Faith itself propose to do? What is it but a scientific arrangement and statement of the truths which are supposed to be taught in the Holy Scriptures? It serves, therefore, as a bond of union between those who agree to receive it, and is the arbiter of all differences which may emerge amongst them. In like manner, this paper is a bond of union upon those points which it professes to cover. Nay, more; it becomes a

symbol in precisely the most objectionable and dangerous form—not simply as coördinate with the Confession, but as its authorized interpretation, so far, at least, as the two cover the same ground. In effect, the appeal will always be taken from the Confession to this instrument, as its acknowledged expounder. According to the oft-repeated maxim, "the *meaning* of the Bible *is* the Bible," the same may be said of the Confession: and in every trial for heresy, the parties must come back to this "Doctrinal Basis" in order to ascertain what the church has decided to be the meaning of her own standards on the topics involved. The general sense of the Presbyterian Church, in accordance with which the United Synod has declared its adoption of these standards, is happily caught and imprisoned in this immortal document; and it comes forth, whenever invoked, to settle the law of the church, and the cases to which that law should be applied. We humbly submit whether the General Assembly is competent to pass upon any such proposition, except to send it down to the presbyteries to determine whether such an addition shall be made to our existing symbols.

Various attempts have been made to escape the force of this objection. For example, it has been suggested that this written declaration is simply a substitute for the customary examination of those who seek admission into any of our presbyteries. This view gains a measure of support from the clause in the report which says, "and it is agreed that no other condition shall be required of the members constituting said presbyteries, except the approval of this plan of union." Dr. Waddel also writes, "While the rule which has been in existence for a long time in our presbyteries, of examining all who apply for admission as to their soundness of doctrine, is not exacted at all in this plan, at the same time it is required of every one who wishes to belong to this new united church, to signify his approval of this plan of union." Unfortunately for this theory, the

examination is of both the parties, who mutually interrogate each other—the applicant who stands before the bar of the presbytery, after undergoing its inquisition, turns round upon his challengers to show their agreement with himself. Plainly this hypothesis must be dismissed as utterly untenable.

Dr. Dabney submits another and very different construction. It is a simple "declaration touching former grounds of debate," and is put on the footing of the countless declarations emanating from the church ever since the days of Arius and the Nicene creed. He finds justifying precedents in the various declarations against error made, about the period of the schism in 1837, by different Synods and by the General Assembly itself. The fallacy of this position has, however, been ably exposed by the editor of the *Southern Presbyterian* in the following extracts, which we give as exhausting the matter:

"We propose now to point out at least two radical differences between all the cases referred to by Dr. D. and the one before us.

The first is, that in every one of those cases quoted, the statement adopted by the church was a testimony against error, intended to define the truth on the points where heresy was to be condemned, and drawn up with a special view to that object; while the statements of the committees are intended to manifest the agreement of parties supposed to have been disagreed as to doctrine, and to prepare a basis on which both can unite. This difference in purpose and intent, in the two cases, will, by well known laws of human nature, produce a marked difference in the result. When men, in the heat of a controversial war, testify against error, they are apt to use terms strong, unambiguous, precise, and sharp to the point. When opponents set to work to agree in a creed, they carefully avoid or modify all expressions which can call out their differences, and adopt vague generalities, or ambiguities, or inconsistent statements, which, by the rule before spoken of, can be interpreted both ways.

The second radical difference between the cases cited by Dr. D. and the one before us is, that while, as already stated, the former were of the nature of a testimony against error, and simply *declara-*

tive, the latter is of the nature of law, and is *legislative*. What is proposed is essentially a compact or treaty between two churches, by virtue of which they are to unite and become one. In the former, the church spoke as a *witness* for her Lord testifying to the truth which He delivered to her trust, and condemning contrary errors. In the latter, she exercises her power of *jurisdiction*, admitting others to her fellowship on their adopting certain doctrinal statements and complying with certain other terms. In this view, we hold the action proposed to be as unconstitutional as it is unwise and inexpedient. The General Assembly, we believe, has no power to admit to the membership of the church on such terms. * * * * * * * * * * The difference is as wide as that between the mere *resolutions* of one of our legislatures, and its formal *acts* and *statutes*. The fact that in the report this statement is called a 'declaration' amounts to nothing. We must look at the real nature of the action proposed."

These distinctions need no amplification at our hands. They are clear in themselves, and are forcibly expressed. No function of the church is more distinctly recognised in Scripture than that of witness for the truth. She is anointed to this express end, that in her formal teachings and in the holiness of her behavior she may proclaim the truth of doctrinal and practical religion to an unbelieving world. She is often called, therefore, to testify against error; shaping her utterance to the thought of the age, tearing away the mask from all untruth, and touching, as with the spear of Ithuriel, the foul spirits who are pouring their seductive blasphemies into the ears of the unsuspecting. These testimonies are, however, by no means to be confounded with the standards which regulate her own faith, nor with the oracles from which her inspiration is drawn. They pass away with the occasions which drew them forth, or remain as historical monuments of the conflicts which she has been called to endure. But no one knows better than the drawer of this paper, that it was not conceived as a declaration against error. On the contrary, it is upon its face a declaration that no error exists, as between these two

parties, to testify against. How then can it be placed upon the footing of those grand deliverances of the past in which heresy and falsehood have been exposed to reprobation and scorn? It is simply a form of concord, in which two parties attempt to show that they are at one. Hence we find no where in the document, the sharpness and precision of testimony which defines the boundaries of error; but instead thereof, the smoothness of conciliation, which bevels off all uncomfortable corners and angles, until not a point is left upon which a controversy can be hung.

We are driven back, then, upon our original position, that this is a pronunciation of doctrine in which the parties profess to agree, binding as soon as it is adopted by them severally, which makes it a virtual symbol of their faith; and, as we have already shewn, from the very circumstances under which it was prepared, a symbol superseding practically the Confession itself, as determining what the parties agree that standard shall mean. Under this view, we object to its adoption by the Assembly, even though, as a paper, it were perfect of its kind. Though a searching criticism should fail to detect a single ambiguity, though it should afford no room for amendment in sentiment or in style, yet, as a symbol, we would reject it as superfluous, and as trenching upon the supremacy of the standards we have already covenanted to uphold. We are not of those who are opposed to creeds. On the contrary, we believe a creed, either long or short, written or unwritten, must exist as the bond of union in every religious body. But we are satisfied with the creed we already have—a creed drawn out over the whole circle of divine truth, closely articulated and held together by the strictest logic—a creed prepared by the wisest men the Church of God has ever known, and at a period peculiarly favorable to the accomplishment of such a task—a creed wrought in the forge of abundant prayer and deliberation through a succession of months and years—and above all, a creed which has with-

stood the storms of more than two centuries, and which is bound up in the most precious associations of the people of God. Such a creed is not to be lightly added to, or taken from, and, least of all, to be superseded by a rival, surreptitiously introduced and covertly palmed upon the church. If there are parties whom our existing Confession does not satisfy, let the proposition be openly made to modify and improve it, and the church will then, at least, know what she has taken in hand; but we trust the Assembly will watch with jealous care, lest this modest declaration of agreement should be found to usurp the functions which belong only to an acknowledged and authoritative symbol.

The foregoing objections are levelled against the proposed doctrinal basis, taken as a whole: we proceed now to a more articulate examination of its several parts, and draw attention,

1. To the section upon imputation, which reads as follows:

"Concerning the fall of man, and original sin, we faithfully hold with the confession of faith, that our first parents, by their first act of disobedience, "fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body; that they being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descended from them by ordinary generation; and that from this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."

This imputation of the guilt of this sin of our first parents we hold in this sense, that thereby their posterity are judicially comdemned by God on account of that sin; and so begin their existence in that corruption of nature, and subjection to wrath, into which our first parents fell by their first sin. And we mean that the guilt of their sin, which is imputed, is according to the constant usage of theology—"obligation to punishment," and not the sinfulness of the act itself;

which latter cannot, by imputation, be the quality of any other than the personal agents."

If the last sentence in this extract is simply a caveat against the dogma that each individual of the human family personally committed the act of eating the forbidden fruit, and by an express exercise of his individual will, participated in the first sin, we have nothing to say except that a spear is hurled against a shadow. Undoubtedly, as individuals, we did not then exist: and it is a clear misconception, if not a wilful misrepresentation of the doctrine of our union with Adam, to suppose that we are transfused into him, having his personal consciousness, and individually doing his act. However useless therefore this disclaimer may be on the part of our new school brethren, we would pass it by as innocent. But when it is remembered that this language is placed upon the lips of the General Assembly, to be uttered by them as explaining the sense of our standards on this vital point, and to be cited hereafter as the authorized interpretation of the church, we cannot but inquire whether it exhausts the testimony of these standards, and gives us the whole doctrine of imputation as therein taught. Our complaint is, that the utterance is both defective and ambiguous. It is defective in that it does not bring out articulately the federal headship of Adam, which is the precise ground upon which this imputation is based. Indeed, if the reader will scan this section closely, there is not even a reference to this most important relation, except in the phrase "that thereby their posterity are judicially condemned by God on account of that sin;" which does certainly imply it, but from which it requires to be inferentially deduced. The committee does indeed quote from the Confession of Faith—but quotes from a passage in which the leading idea was to affirm the transmission of depravity by natural descent from Adam, as "the root of all mankind," rather than to state the formal ground upon which

that penalty is incurred. Other passages are passed over in silence, which distinctly affirm the federal and representative relation of Adam as being the principle which determines the imputation of his guilt to all his posterity. For example, in the seventh chapter of the Confession it is said, "the first covenant made with man was a covenant of works wherein life was promised to Adam, and *in him to all his posterity*, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." Again, the answer to the twenty-second question in the larger Catechism testifies, "the covenant being made with Adam *as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity*, all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, *sinned in him and fell with him in that first transgression.*" We do not, of course, intimate that this vital truth is even doubted by our respected committee, nor that it is denied by the members of the United Synod. But it does appear strange that, in a section explaining how the doctrine of imputation is received by the church, there should be no explicit statement of that legal relation which our standards recognise as "*cardo causæ*," the very principle which determines that there shall be any imputation; and that in a paper which is to operate as a test of orthodoxy, it should be recognised only by an implication from which it is drawn out by a remote inference.

There have been those who admit the inherent depravity of man, but deny the strict imputation of Adam's sin as the moral ground upon which it rests. Under the operation of the universal law by which like begets its like, this corrupt nature is transmitted as a natural consequence of the Fall. If Adam had begotten a son during the period of his innocence, that son would have been born holy; but as Eve did not conceive till after he fell, the race that issued from his loins was unholy, by the same law of propagation. In consequence of the corrupt nature, thus inherited, the sinner is justly condemned; and it is only *mediately*, through this inherent depravity, he has any thing to do with Adam's

sin. Here, then, is a sense in which the imputation of the first transgression is nominally conceded, while yet it is in fact exactly denied. The orthodox belief is precisely inverted: for while that considers imputation as prior to condemnation, and, of course, as prior to inherent corruption, this theory regards depravity of nature as the cause of condemnation, and thus remotely of imputation. To guard against the possibility of errors like these, the committee should not have left at the mercy of a mere inference that important relation to Adam as our covenant head, which underlies and supports this whole doctrine of imputation. But is the committee's language sufficient to detect and expose the speculations of the United Synod itself on this subject? We beg the reader to examine with care the following extract from the *Christian Observer*, of February 20, 1862:

"We believe (1) that Adam was so the representative of his race, that his act would determine their character. If he had continued holy, they would have been holy. But as he sinned, they, as a consequence, became sinners. 2. We believe that in consequence of this representative relation of Adam, his posterity are treated as sinners, on account of his sin—that is, are liable to suffering and death on account of his act. We do not believe that God regards the posterity of Adam as *meriting* his wrath for the sin of their original progenitor—in other words, that the '*moral turpitude*' of his act is transferred to them. But we do believe that, in as much as the evils brought upon the race are an expression of the Lawgiver's disapprobation of the sin of Adam, and were thus *designed* to show his regard for his law and his determination to uphold it, they may be termed *penal* evils, or what Dr. Thornwell would call the 'judicial result' of the sin of Adam. God does not inflict these evils upon succeeding generations as an arbitrary sovereign, or simply because Adam was the head of the race, irrespective of the claims of his violated law. It is as lawgiver, determined to give the highest possible expression of his abhorrence of the sin of Adam that he can give in this world, that the Almighty brings upon Adam's descendants suf-

ferings as the consequence of his trangression. Their sufferings, therefore, are the result of the first sin, are *penal, judicial* sufferings; whilst at the same time Adam alone, their representative, is the *criminal* individual."

Here then is a confession of faith for us! "Adam *so* the representative of his race that his act determines their character"—this is all the imputation in the case, just the mediate imputation of Placœus in the 17th century! Adam's posterity "treated as sinners on account of his sin," which, however, only means that "they are liable to suffering and death on account of that act!" But are these evils brought upon the race as calamities only? Oh no, says Dr. Boyd, they are "*penal, judicial* sufferings"—that is, "they *may be termed* penal," but only as "an expression of the Lawgiver's disapprobation of the sin of Adam, and designed to show his regard for his law and his determination to uphold it!" Does not the reader see that the whole is constructive and technical throughout? Adam is constructively a representative, since the result of his sin is that his posterity are sinners—and the "evils brought upon the race" are constructively penal, because they express the Lawgiver's abhorrence of the sin of Adam, for which reason, "as the consequence of his transgression," they fall upon his descendants. Not a word here of the covenant relation of Adam to his race as their federal head, and of their undergoing a full probation in him: but only an undescribed representation of some sort, and a constructive imputation, in consequence of which they suffer certain consequences that are only technically penal. Yet the writer of this ambiguous confession has accepted the doctrinal basis of the committee, and lends it his influence that it may be adopted by the body to which he belongs—and according to his own theory, he can swallow the committee's testimony of our being judicially condemned on account of the first sin without the slightest contortion of

face; for he has only to understand it in a Pickwickian sense—a *quasi* judicial condemnation, as being the result of that first sin, and inflicted by the Lawgiver to show his disapprobation of the same. Dr. Boyd has gone through the meshes of the committee's net in the language of another, without "ruffling a single feather."

Before dismissing this deliverance of the committee, we have a word to say about the ambiguity of the disclaimer; "and not the sinfulness of the act itself, which latter cannot by imputation be the quality of any other than the personal agents." As already stated, we have no objection to this as merely disavowing the notion of personal identity between Adam and his race. In our distinct and separate personality, his sin could no more be ours than ours could be his. But, then, what does the Catechism mean when it says that, "we sinned in him and fell with him in that first transgression?" The doctrine unquestionably is that, by the appointment of God, Adam's posterity were united to him, not only by the natural tie of physical descent, but also by a moral relation of covenant headship, in consequence of which he and they were constituted a legal unit. The race was put upon its trial in the person of its representative—in the eye of the law, Adam was the race—his obedience would have been theirs by a proprietary right in it, as truly as though it had been rendered in their individual persons—and this being recognized by imputation, they would have been entitled to eternal life as the reward of the covenant. It follows, *ex equali*, that his disobedience was theirs; which, being reckoned or imputed to them, put them equally with their representative under condemnation. The act of Adam, as a public person, must belong to all those for whom he was a surety. It is theirs as well as his; not theirs as personally committed by them, but upon the principle—*qui facit per alium, facit per se;* and their title to it is as perfect and indefeasible as that of Adam himself. Imputation is the formal recognition of this title,

the judicial decree, rendered in due process of law, by which the provisions of the covenant are carried out in successive generations. We do not care to enter into any discussion upon the generic unity of the human race, nor to quarrel with those who are indisposed to press beyond the appointment of God for a reason of this imputation. All that we contend for is the recognition of the truth, that we are "in Adam *virtually* as a natural root, and *representatively* as a covenant head;" and this union in him, mysterious and inexplicable as it may be, we are unwilling even by implication to disavow. By virtue of this union, we believe, with our standards, that we "sinned in Adam, and fell with him in that first transgression;" so that there is, on our part, a true and real, not a constructive and fictitious, responsibility, for the same. Dr. Boyd is unwilling to believe that "God regards the posterity of Adam as *meriting* his wrath for the sin of their original progenitor." We do not insist upon a term so equivocal as that of merit, which, if used by us, would be understood by him in a sense different from that intended. But a holy God treats Adam's posterity only as they deserve to be treated; they are now as much entitled to condemnation and wrath through the disobedience of their head, as they would have been entitled to life through his obedience. If any object, with Dr. Barnes, that the phrase, "sinning in Adam," is unintelligible, as confounding personal acts and personal consciousnesses, we commend them to the apostle's argument for the superiority of the priesthood of Melchizedec over that of Aaron, by the fact that Levi paid tithes to him in the loins of Abraham; "and as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedec met him." If Abraham's act, in paying the tenth of the spoils to Melchizedec, was the act of Levi, virtually present and acting in the loins of his father, we see no reason for scrupling to say that we sinned in Adam, as virtually and representa-

tively in him; and if the acknowledgement by Abraham, of the superior dignity of Melchizedec, was a profession of the same by Levi yet unborn, then we do not hesitate to say that the quality of sinfulness in Adam's transgression belongs in that same putative sense to his descendants.

We call attention,

2. To the portion of the same section which treats of the sinner's inability, in the following terms:

> "We do also believe that because of this original corruption, men have 'wholly lost all ability of will' to choose spiritual good for its own sake, or to regenerate, convert or sanctify their own hearts. But we equally reject the error of those who assert that the sinner has no power of any kind for the performance of duty. This error strips the sinner of his moral agency and accountableness, and introduces the heresy of either Antinomianism or Fatalism. The true doctrine of the Scriptures, as stated in our confession, keeps continually in view the moral agency of man, the contingency of second causes, the use of means, the voluntariness of all the creature's sin, and his utter inexcusableness therein. It teaches that while the fall has darkened and impaired all the faculties of man's soul, and inclined his free will to evil only, it has not destroyed in him any capacity of understanding or conscience whereby the holy creature knows and serves God, and on which free agency and responsibility depend."

The feature of this paper, which makes it so fatal to the purity, and therefore to the peace, of the Church, is, that whilst it allows apparently the most innocent disclaimers on the part of our New School brethren, it does it in language so incautious as to open the door for the importation of the worst heresies that can afflict the Church of God. It thus requires a running commentary on the part of its framers, assuring us that they do not mean this, and they do not mean that, so as to render it utterly worthless as a touchstone of orthodoxy. For example, in the preceding extract, after a clear avowal of the sinner's inability to choose spiritual good, and that the Fall has inclined his free will to evil only, the committee turn round and upset

it all by the bold, unguarded denial, "that the sinner has no power of any kind for the performance of duty." Undoubtedly the two statements, in any proper sense, are contradictories. Why, then, is the latter introduced at all? Simply because the New School are afraid that a round assertion of the sinner's inability, will "strip him of his moral agency and accountableness, and introduce the heresy of either Antinomianism or Fatalism." Are we, then, to admit this implied impeachment of our standards, that without this important qualification they will take the sinner out of the moral government of God, and leave him an irresponsible agent, free from all accountability? Is not the allegation infinitely absurd, when, from beginning to end, the Confession holds every man so strictly to the law, that his only hope of escape from condemnation and wrath is through the sovereign grace of God? Is it not a wicked and wilful slander, when these very standards, besides other testimonies, expressly declare "the will of man to be endued with that natural liberty that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to good or evil?" Are we, for a moment, to allow that Antinomianism and Fatalism are any thing else but a rejection of Calvinism on the one side, as Arminianism is on the other? Is the Old School church to purge herself of the taint of these monstrous heresies, before the purists of the New School will consent to union with her? But offensive as the language of the report was under this view, we did not construe it as any thing more than an unguarded and conflicting utterance of the committee, until we read the elaborate defence of the paper from the same pen by which it was drafted. In that unfortunate polemic, which our brother will live to regret that it was ever written, Dr. Dabney justifies the "naughty words" on the ground that they were taken from a document written by the wise and good Dr. Baxter, and adopted by the Synod of Virginia in 1836. If so, it is only another illustration how unsafe are the doc-

trinal statements of the best men, which are drawn up for the purposes of concession and compromise. But this matter is not to be decided upon any other authority except that of our acknowledged standards. "We reject the error," says the report, "of those who assert that the sinner has no power of any kind for the performance of duty;" which implies, of course, says Dr. Dabney, that the sinner has some power of some kind to perform his duty. Let us, then, lay over against this unqualified and broad language the testimonies of our standards. Amongst others, take the following: "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto." Confession, ch. 9. Again, the larger Catechism, question 25, on original sin: "Whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually." And in question 192: "Acknowledging that by nature we and all men are not only utterly unable and unwilling to know and to do the will of God, but prone to rebel against his word, * * * and wholly inclined to do the will of the flesh and of the devil; we pray that God would by His Spirit take away from ourselves and others all blindness, weakness, indisposedness, and perverseness of heart, and by His grace make us able and willing to know, do, and submit to His holy will," &c. We will not attempt to make the contrast more emphatic between these passages and the committee's report, by the use of italics, but quote them exactly as they are found in the book.

But it will be rejoined, these citations are nothing to the point, since they refer to the *moral* inability of the sinner, which the report distinctly affirms, and not to his *natural* inability, which the report as distinctly denies. Accord-

ingly, Dr. Dabney attempts at length to show that, whilst the committee rejected these terms as ambiguous and unhappy, the distinction which they express must be retained —that it is indispensable, in order to make out the responsibility of the sinner, and is implied in all the efforts of the preacher in dealing practically with the conscience. Alas! that our brother should thus "speak half in the speech of Ashdod!" Is not this the identical language in which the hereditary enemies of Calvinism have always endeavored to excite the prejudices of unthinking and uncritical men? and are not these the arguments by which the old theology of the church has ever been assailed? We venture to say that this painful embarrassment would not have been felt by our excellent brother in his theological chair at Prince Edward: but as a committee man at Lynchburg, he had a new and strange rôle to play, as the special advocate of New School opinions, and he works awkwardly in the harness. The transparent fallacy of his whole argument is exposed by a single interrogatory of the editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*, when he asks, "does not Dr. Dabney get confused between "powers" and "power?" *Acu rem tetigit*, the very core of the difficulty is reached. If a single iota served to separate the Arians and Orthodox of old, it is not strange that the letter *s* should settle this whole distinction between responsibility and ability, which seem so hard to harmonize. "Our Confession and Catechisms," adds Mr. Porter, "while they attribute to man certain *powers* in the sense of faculties and endowments, those namely which constitute him a responsible being, deny, most categorically, the possession of any '*power*' to perform his duty." Undoubtedly, if the fall had obliterated all the faculties of the human soul, the sinner would be taken out of the category of a moral being; he would cease to be a man, and could, no more than any other brute, lie under the jurisdiction of the divine law. But what has this to do with the question, whether a fallen being, whose

original faculties are depraved by sin, has power to perform duties which can only be wrought when these faculties are sound and pure? This is the exact point under debate: it is the ability of the sinner to perform *moral* acts—and though he may possess the faculties which are essential to constitute him a reasonable and responsible being, if these are disabled by sin, then is he destitute of the very power which is required in the premises. The real difficulty lies in reconciling this responsibility with the want of *moral* ability; and the fact that the sinner continues to possess those natural faculties or "powers" which make him a man, does not afford even a proximate solution. How if the sinner be born destitute of those dispositions and habits which are necessary for duty,—can he be held responsible for his delinquency? Manifestly, if he had been originally created without this moral power, he could not be held answerable for the want of spiritual obedience: and the only solution of the difficulty is, that this inability is the penal visitation of God upon sin. Moral inability, which is all that is truly involved in the case, does not discharge the sinner from obligation, simply because it was not the original condition of man as he came from the hands of his Creator; it has been brought upon him by sin—and he is responsible for it precisely in the same way that he is responsible for the inherent corruption which produces it. We have lying before us an unpublished manuscript from the pen of the venerated Dr. Thornwell, from which we transcribe a passage as superseding all that we would say. It bears directly upon the topic now under discussion, and will be read with interest as an earnest of what is to be enjoyed when these lectures shall see the light.

"We must distinguish between inability as original, and inability as penal. Moral power is nothing more nor less than holy habitudes and disposition—it is the perception of the beauty, and the response of the heart to the excellence and glory of God—and the con-

sequent subjection of the will, to the law of holy love. Spiritual perception, spiritual delight, spiritual choice, these, and these alone, constitute ability to good. Now if we could conceive that God had made a creature destitute of these habits—if we could conceive that he came from the hands of the Creator in the same moral condition in which he is now born, it is impossible to vindicate the obligation of such a creature to holiness upon any principle of justice. It is idle to say that his inability is but the intensity of his sin, and the more helpless, the more wicked. His inability is the result of his constitution—it belongs to his very nature as a creature—and he is no more responsible for such defects than a lame man is for his hobbling gait, or a blind man for his incompetency to distinguish colors. He is what God made him; he answers to the idea of his being; and is no more blameworthy for the deformed condition of his soul, than a camel for the deformity of its back. The principle is intuitively evident that no creature can be required to transcend its powers. Ability conditions responsibility. An original inability, natural in the sense that it enters into the notion of the creature as such, completely obliterates all moral distinctions with reference to the acts embraced within its sphere. And if this had been what the advocates of natural ability meant, their position would have been impregnable. But this is not what they mean; they do not represent the natural as that which pertains to the idea and original state of the creature. In this sense, moral and natural ability are not distinguished as separate species; but the moral is the natural ability—the moral habits are the very things by which a moral creature possesses any ability to do good at all. They contend, on the other hand, that there may be the entire absense of all holy principles, of all spiritual discernment and love—and yet that the creature thus destitute of these may be possessed of power of another kind to do good, upon which his responsibility is conditioned. Upon their hypothesis, it is conceivable that a man may be originally corrupt as a creature, and yet under obligation to keep the perfect law of God. Their ability, when narrowly examined, turns out to be a mere play with the ambiguity of language, or the denial in one form of what they have affirmed in another. Sometimes it is represented as the mere possession of the faculties, and attributes of reason, intelligence and will, abstracted from any determinate states in relation to holi-

ness and sin. A being thus existing in *puris naturalibus* we have already seen to involve an absurdity—its very attitude of indeterminateness to good would be sin. It is precisely in the character of its determinations, and of them alone, that its good and evil consist. * * * * * * These distinctions and evasions show conclusively that the natural ability which I make essential to responsibility, is a very different thing from that which many divines have invented as the condition on which man is responsible since the fall.

But there is another, a penal inability. It is that which man has superinduced by his own voluntary transgression. He was naturally able; that is, created with all the habitudes and dispositions which were involved in the loving choice of the good. Rectitude was infused into his nature; it entered into the idea of his being; he was fully competent for any exaction of the law. He chooses sin, and by that very act of choice impregnates his nature with contrary habits and dispositions. His moral agency continues unimpaired through all his subsequent existence; he becomes a slave to sin; but his impotence, hopeless and ruinous as it is, results from his own free choice. In the loss of habits, he loses all real power for good; he becomes competent for nothing but sin; but he is held responsible for the nature which God gave him—and the law which constitutes its eternal norm, according to the divine idea, and the spontaneous dictates of his own reason, can never cease to be the standard of his being and life. All his descendants were in him when he sinned and fell. His act was legally theirs; and that depravity, which he infused into his own nature, in the place of original righteousness, has become their inheritance. They stand therefore, from the first moment of their being, in the same relation to the law which he occupied at his fall. Their impotence is properly their own—how this can be, this is not the place to show. I am only showing that there is a marked distinction between the inability which begins with the nature of a being, and the inability which it brings upon itself by sin: that in the one case, responsibility is measured by the extent of the actual power possessed—in the other, by the extent of the power originally imparted," &c.

3. Our failing space warns us to take up the third section of the committee's report, on the atonement, as follows:

"Concerning the atonement of Jesus Christ, we hold that He, being very God and very man in one person, was our substitute under the law; that the guilt of men's sins was imputed to him; that His sufferings were borne as the penalty of that guilt, and were a vicarious, yet true satisfaction therefor, to the justice of God; and that without this, God's perfections would forbid the pardon of any sin. This atonement, we believe, though by temporary sufferings, was by reason of the infinite glory of Christ's person, full and sufficient for the guilt of the whole world; and is to be freely and sincerely offered to every creature, inasmuch as it leaves no other obstacle to the pardon of all men under the Gospel, save the enmity and unbelief of those who voluntarily reject it. Wherefore, on the one hand, we reject the opinion of those who teach that the atonement was so limited and equal to the guilt of the elect only, that if God had designed to redeem more, Christ must have suffered more, or differently. And on the other hand, we hold that God the Father doth efficaciously apply this redemption, through Christ's purchase, to all those to whom it was His eternal purpose to apply it, and to no others."

Upon this fundamental doctrine of atonement, the utterance of the committee should have been the most full and explicit, instead of being the most exceptionable in their whole paper. The first question turns, of course, upon the *nature* of the atonement—what is it that makes the death of Christ a true satisfaction to the broken law? The uniform testimony of our standards is, that Christ, as the strict and proper substitute for his people under the law, rendered a perfect obedience to its precepts, and incurred the penalty denounced against the transgressor; which, by virtue of his federal relation to the elect, is reckoned to them as their righteousness, so that, when received by faith, they are not only discharged from condemnation, but are accepted in their persons before God. Thus the Confession, ch. 8, sec. 4—"This office the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake, which, that he might discharge, he *was made under the law and did perfectly fulfil it*," &c. Again, in section 5; "The

Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which He, through the eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, *hath fully satisfied the justice of His Father;* and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance," &c. The Larger Catechism, Question 49, on the humiliation of Christ—"having also conflicted with the terrors of death and the powers of darkness, *felt and borne the weight of God's wrath*, He laid down His life an offering for sin," &c. Language like this it would seem impossible to mystify. For if Christ was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfil it, one would think he must come under and perfectly fulfil the two parts of law, the precept and penalty, the union of which constitutes the formal nature of law. If He fulfilled the precept by obeying it, He must equally have fulfilled the penalty by enduring it; and this is *the obedience unto death* of which the Scriptures speak. Yet our slippery opponents, who seem to think, with Talleyrand, language an invention to conceal thought, through a subtle interpretation contrive to evade the force of all this testimony. They admit, for example, that Christ was a substitute for the guilty, that His sufferings and death were vicariously endured, that they were penal inflictions, and rendered satisfaction to the injured law and insulted majesty of God. All this is well, if the words were employed in their usual signification; but when the key to the cipher is put into our hands, it turns out that they are all to be understood in a *quasi* sense. Thus, the sufferings of Christ were not inflicted as *the* penalty threatened to the transgressor, but what was *an equivalent in effect* for it; and they are termed penal, constructively, because the demands of the law or lawgiver are virtually answered by the death of Christ, and the end of the penalty subserved, to wit, the manifestation of God's holiness, and the maintenance of His authority. That the reader may not suspect us of drawing a caricature of their views, we present an extract from A. H. H. B., in the *Christian Observer* for March 13,

1862. And we quote thus frequently from this writer, because he is an acknowledged leader in the United Synod, because he has been endorsed by his own brethren in their election of him as a professor in their projected seminary, because he has written these sentences with special reference to a union between his body and our own, and because, with these utterances yet warm upon his lips, he has accepted the paper of the committees of conference upon which we are now commenting. Dr. Boyd says:

"But it may be asked, did Christ suffer the penalty of the law? We answer, yes, if it be meant to inquire whether the sufferings of Christ had the same effect and a like value in the moral government of God as the penalty of the law. But if it is intended by the question to inquire whether Christ suffered, in kind or degree, the *exact penalty* threatened to the sinner, or whether he endured the penalty of the law in such as a sense as that God is bound by his *justice* to deliver from punishment all for whom he died, we answer, no."

He then goes on to show that the Savior's sufferings were not eternal, and that he had no remorse of conscience, to all which we agree, and that these constitute the very essence of the penalty, which we as distinctly deny. Then he adds:

"The great practical question, with reference to this point, is not whether Christ suffered *the precise penalty* threatened to the sinner, but whether his sufferings were *penal* in their nature—that is, whether they were designed by the law-giver to uphold his government by being substituted in place of the punishment due to transgressors. They were not mere chastisements; they were not intended by God simply to be instructive or symbolical, and as an illustration of patience under suffering. But the great peculiarity of the Savior's agonies was that they were a *vicarious, expiatory* offering, designed to accomplish all the ends to be secured by the infliction of the penalty of the law upon transgressors. The demands of the law or lawgiver are *virtually* answered by the death of Christ, inasmuch as all the good ends of the law, which would have been

secured by the sinner's punishment, have been accomplished by Christ's obedience and death. His sufferings therefore were literally and truly *penal* in their nature."

Literally and truly penal, indeed! When it is openly declared that they were a substitution for the penalty, and of another kind from that inflicted upon the transgressor! Can the reader fail to penetrate the fraud, which is practised by all heresiarchs, of using even to profuseness the consecrated dialect of the Church, which, by a transposition of meaning, is made to convey the very errors it was intended to disown and denounce? What have we here beyond a merely technical penalty, and a constructive and fictitious imputation? The adroitness of the argument by which this view is supported, is worthy of the subtlety in which it was invented. Put in a compact form, it runs thus: the penalty against the sinner is death—Christ did not die eternally, therefore He did not undergo the precise penalty, but only an equivalent to it. The conclusion is vitiated, however, by the quiet assumption that eternity of suffering is of the *essence* of the penalty. If this should be disproved, the whole argument falls to the ground. Now, in the Scriptures, the phrase, the wrath of God, is used with almost technical precision for the judicial displeasure of God against sin expressed in the penalty of the law. "The wrath of God," says the apostle, "is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." In like manner, the Catechism describes the sufferings of Christ in their relation to the law, as the "feeling and bearing the weight of God's wrath." This wrath, when it terminates upon such a being as man, issues in death; as terminating upon his body, in temporal death; as terminating upon his soul, in separating it from communion with God, which is spiritual death; and since the finite creature can never exhaust that wrath, in eternal banishment of soul and body in hell. But when this wrath terminates

upon such a being as the Lord Jesus, who is the God-man, it separates between the soul and body, and cuts him off from all communion with the Father in the hour when, as a sacrifice, he passes under his judicial displeasure,—but it does not banish him forever from the divine favor. By virtue of the hypostatic union, all the dignity and glory and resources of the divine nature were carried over to the work which was wrought in the human; and a person so mysteriously constituted, who shall say that he could not bear the wrath of God in all the fulness in which it was originally expressed in the penalty? We recoil, indeed, from the profaneness which undertakes to weigh in the scales of human judgment, or to measure in the scant proportions of human thought, the awful sufferings of our blessed Lord; and it is for this reason that we reject the presumptuous dogma of our opponents, that He did not bear *the* penalty of the law. God forbid that we should attempt to lift the veil from those transcendent sufferings which once caused the rocks to rend, and broke the slumbers even of the dead! It is enough for us to know that He "felt and bore the weight of God's wrath," that He did undergo the Father's judicial displeasure, to satisfy us that He did endure the essence of the penalty originally denounced against the transgressor.

How, then, does the committee propose to protect the Church against these equivocations?—by testifying that "His (Christ's) sufferings were borne *as* the penalty of that guilt, and were a vicarious, yet true, satisfaction therefor to the justice of God." But as we have seen, these parties have no hesitation in affirming these sufferings to be vicarious; alas! too much so, since Christ was not only a substitute personally for his people, but his sufferings were also substituted in the place of the penalty. They have no hesitation in affirming them to be a satisfaction, and even a true satisfaction, to divine justice; for they "had the same effect and a like value in the moral government of

God, as the penalty of the law." How, then, shall they be tied up from all evasion? We answer, most certainly not by placing in their lips the very ambiguity they desire in the clause, "His sufferings were borne *as* the penalty." We have read and admired the dialectic skill of Dr. Dabney in his defence of this favorite little particle; but must say after all, if the New School men wish a formula precisely suited to their equivocations on this point, it is kindly furnished to their hands in this significantly ambiguous sentence.

The second great question upon the doctrine of atonement relates to its *intention* and *design*: for whom was it made? Here the issue between us and the New School is open and clear. They maintain that the atonement was designed, and of course did make a true satisfaction for the sins of all men. This is so distinctly avowed, that quotations from their writings are almost needless. But that the reader may have directly before his eyes, the position assumed by members of the United Synod, the body so soon to be incorporated with ourselves, we make a last extract from their representative writer, already so profusely cited. Dr. Boyd says:

"Among the ministers of the United Synod, there are few, if any, who do not believe that the sacrifice of the Saviour was *intended* by God as a means by which *every child of Adam might be saved.*" Again; "We hold that in the covenant made between the Father and the Son, the Son covenants to lay down His life in behalf of the *whole* family of man; so that every obstacle to salvation, arising from the character and government of God, is actually removed, and was *intended* to be removed, that thus every one of Adam's race might be saved."

If any one will point out the difference between this and the view of Arminians, that Christ died, not actually to secure salvation to any, but to render salvation possible to all, we will do homage to his critical discernment. And

then we will propose another riddle for solution: How, upon his acknowledged principle that Christ is a substitute for men, and renders satisfaction to divine justice by vicarious, penal sufferings, if He lays down His life in behalf of the *whole* family of man, Dr. Boyd can be saved from drifting into open and confessed Universalism? The following dreadful alternative is his only refuge:

"Whilst we believe and teach that the atonement of Christ had a general reference to mankind at large, we at the same time hold that in the covenant between the Father and the Son, *special* reference was had to those who shall finally be saved. In other words, the Father covenants to give to the Son, 'as a reward for the travail of His soul,' a part of those for whom He dies; that this His death may not be vain as respects the actual salvation of souls."

Our very flesh creeps as we transcribe these dreadful words, which do not fall short of positive blasphemy. Think of it, reader; Christ receiving as His reward a part only of the souls for whom He dies! the stupendous scheme of grace barely saved from disastrous failure! Christ's death confessed to be inefficacious, and failing of its design with reference to a part of those for whom He died! and a just and holy God twice exacting the penalty, which, though satisfied by the surety, still takes vengeance upon the principal! Is this, or any thing like this, the doctrine of our standards? Is it not plainly denied, and the definiteness of the atonement affirmed, in all those passages which speak of Christ as "*purchasing reconciliation,*" and as "certainly and effectually *applying and communicating redemption to all those for whom he hath purchased it*"—and as "*fully discharging the debt,* by his obedience and death, of all those that are justified," and "making *a proper and real and full satisfaction* to His Father's justice in their behalf?" Is there no distinction here as to the parties whom the atonement was made? Did He lay down His life for the *whole* family of man, when redemption is declared to be

effectually applied to all those for whom it was purchased? If so, how are we to avoid the conclusion that the *whole* family of man will be saved? It was, therefore, with a feeling of sadness, like that one feels at the grave of the dead, that we first read the following challenge of Dr. Dabney; "he demands that we shall say that Christ was *only* the elect's substitute, and bore the guilt *only* of the elect's sins —show us the place where either the Bible or Confession says so." Is it not woven into the whole texture of both? Is it not taught in the whole doctrine of substitution, and of full satisfaction to divine justice by vicarious sufferings? "I lay down my life for the sheep," says the Bible: "neither are any other redeemed by Christ but the elect only," says the Confession of Faith.

We turn then to the committee's report to hear its voice upon this important point; and lo! there is no voice, but on the contrary, a most painful and ominous silence—a silence, too, which is unquestionably intentional; for was it not the committee's object to bring the two bodies together, and here is the very spot at which differences might emerge. But would that there had been only silence! The paper, not content with silence when it should have spoken, speaks at last when silence would have been wisdom: "and is to be freely and sincerely offered to every creature, inasmuch as it leaves *no other obstacle to the pardon of all men under the Gospel, save the enmity and unbelief of those who voluntarily reject it.*" Doubtless there is a construction of this broad and bold declaration upon which the committee can subscribe it *salva fide*, and which we have not the time here to explore; but taken in connexion with the entire silence upon the question whether the atonement be in its intention definite or indefinite, there can be no doubt of the interpretation that will be put upon it as favoring the general atonement theory. Last of all, we have the limitation placed, just where the New School have always placed it, in the decree of election restricting only the ap-

plication. Thus the order is completely reversed in which the purposes of God in reference to human salvation come to be considered: God looking upon the fallen sons of Adam; determining to provide and offer them a Saviour; then electing those to whom that salvation shall be effectually applied. We will not pause to discuss the correctness of this arrangement, but content ourselves with saying that it is not the order recognised in our standards. Thus the Confession, ch. 3, sec. 6, says: "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ," &c. This redemption being among the means by which the purpose of election is carried out, the latter must be in logical order before the former. Putting these three things together, this section of the committee's report by its very form and structure carries the Assembly over, and, so far as this utterance of the General Assembly can do it, the whole church over to the assertion of an indefinite atonement. If it should be said, the Old School body has always tolerated a diversity of opinion upon the extent of the atonement, we answer, that is altogether a different affair from the Assembly affirming a general atonement, and construing it as the doctrine of the church, contrary, as we believe, both to the spirit and letter of our existing symbols.

We have now completed our review of this important document. Some minor points might well be considered, rather as matters of inquiry than of objection. For example, whether the union of two distinct bodies, coming together by treaty, will affect the historical succession of the Assembly, or jeopard its legal privileges and rights? Whether the Assembly has the constitutional power to pass finally upon the paper of the committee, without sending it down for ratification to the Presbyteries? And whether finally it be expedient to decide a question so materially

affecting the fortunes of the church, at a time when the public mind is too distracted to give it due attention, and when from the circumstances of the country no inconsiderable portion will be shut out from a representation on the floor of the Assembly? But the discussion of points like these we leave to others. We have confined our strictures to the doctrinal basis submitted in the report; and can truthfully declare that never did we undertake a task more reluctantly, and more entirely from a sense of duty to God and the church. It will be observed, too, that we have not assailed the orthodoxy of the report, nor of those by whom it has been framed. Its authors are men who stand high in the confidence and esteem of the whole church; and those of them whom it has been our privilege personally to know, enjoy no small measure of our love. But this very esteem, which they so deservedly enjoy, renders their paper only so much the more dangerous to a confiding church, predisposed to take much upon trust from parties whom she has delighted to honor. We do not impugn the doctrinal purity of any one of them, when we assert the ambiguities of the report to be such as to render it as mischievous a document as could engage the consideration of our highest court. We believe that, if adopted by the Assembly, it will become the nest of a thousand heresies to vex the repose of the church—the source of strifes and controversies which will outlast the generation which framed and accepts it, and leading to possible separations in the future as painful as those which are now attempted to be healed. Under this conviction we have been constrained to lift the voice of warning—"*equo ne credite, Teucri!*" If the United Synod is really at one with us upon the great doctrines of grace, we will go as far as any in overcoming technical difficulties, and will by God's grace seek to bury all past feuds. And if they are with us in faith and order, let it be ascertained by a square and unreserved adoption of our acknowledged standards, in their obvious and literal im-

port. All these attempts, by conventions and conferences, to construct platforms of union, only prejudice and retard the movement. Let us have no more of this nibbling at the Confession of Faith, and of this paring down its statements to the very minimum of orthodoxy. Let us have no more declarations of adherence to these sacred instruments, with an appendix of reservations and explanations like a codicil annulling a will. A plain, straightforward, honest subscription to the Confession and other symbols, will place the parties on ground which both understand; and there will be union, when alone union can be found, *through the truth.* We pray God that our next Assembly may preëminently be guided by the wisdom which cometh from above, which is first *pure*, then *peaceable.*

ERRATA.

Page 201, line 2: for "reverence belongs," read "vengeance belongeth."

Page 202, line 3: after "men," insert "and;" line 6: after "quote," insert "from."

Page 204, line 13: for "and to fight," read "and fight."

Page 206, line 28: for "requiring," read "require;" line 33: after "distinct," insert "from it;" line 34: for first "and," read "being."

Page 210, line 13: after "also," insert "of."

Page 234, line 11: for "cause," read "curse."

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.
VOL. XVI.—NO. 4.

MARCH, MDCCCLXVI.

ARTICLE I.

PURITANISM AND PRESBYTERIANISM.

Puritanism is one of those great historical facts about which men have differed ever since its rise, and will doubtless continue to differ for a long time to come. Some denounce it as the embodiment of all that is narrow, bigoted, and intolerant, whilst others exalt it as the source and champion of all true civil and religious liberty. These denunciations have acquired a fresh bitterness and frequency from the great events that are going on around us. Regarding, as many do, that form of Puritanism which is found in New England as the grand agency that has produced the terrible conflict through which we have just passed, there is no form of condemnation too severe to be applied by them to Puritanism in general, and to every thing that is supposed to have any affiliation with it. Hence the Puritan, without regard to past or present, is denounced, ridiculed, and condemned by orators, editors, preachers, and talkers, without stint and without discrimination, and in many cases without knowledge or reason. Nor is this all. Every thing that is

presumed to have any connexion with Puritanism comes in for a share of this sweeping condemnation. This is especially true of Presbyterianism. By many, Puritanism is regarded as only one of the forms of Presbyterianism, and when they speak of the one, they mean the other. They consider the Puritans of New England as Presbyterians; and in denouncing the one system, they intend to denounce the other. Hence an odium is attached, and meant to be attached, to Presbyterianism, because of its supposed identity with Puritanism, that works seriously to its injury with the ignorant and unreflecting. It is true that this opinion is more frequently met with in private than in public, but it exists so extensively, that it is proper to furnish some corrective to it. If these two systems differ as broadly as any other divisions of the Protestant world, it is unfair to the truth of history, and unfair to those on both sides who hold to them to confound them, or to make one responsible for the acts or spirit of the other. That they do thus differ is a fact of which no intelligent theologian is ignorant; but, as many even among our own people do not know the breadth and length of this difference, it may be well to set it forth. In doing this, our object will not be to discuss the merits of either system, or decide the questions that have been raised concerning them, but simply to show that they differ as widely as any other forms of Protestantism, and that no one can therefore honestly confound them, or charge the one with the temper and conduct of the other.

There is great confusion in many minds as to what is really meant by Puritanism, and this term must be explained before any clear argument can be raised concerning it. Like the term Protestantism, it included originally those who afterwards became widely separated in opinion; and before affirming or denying any thing about Puritans, we must know what class of them is meant. Hooper, Hugh Peters, and Henry Ward Beecher, are all called Puritans, yet differ in essential respects as widely as men can differ; and before arguing about the term, we must know the class of persons included in it.

It is obvious that the Puritanism with which we have to do in

this argument is that system and sect which peopled New England, and which, under Cromwell and his contemporaries, played so important a part in old England. The Presbyterianism with which we have to do is that which exists in this country. Now these two great historical developments differ as widely as most of the diverse sections of Protestantism.

They differ in their origin. Puritanism is English in its parentage. When Henry VIII. made the Church of England Protestant, it was not because he wished to change his religion, but because he wished to change his wife. Being a Romanist at heart, he retained as much of the old religion as he could. This was distasteful to many of the real Protestants in England, who wished to purify the Church from these Romish features, especially during the brief reign of Edward VI. But little was accomplished until the accession of bloody Mary, when they were burnt, banished, and persecuted without mercy. Under Elizabeth they fared but little better, for she was probably a Romanist at heart, and treated Puritans with much more severity than Papists. During her reign there were but few disputes about Church government, except the occasional utterances of Cartwright, and others of lesser note, although many would have preferred a simpler form. The main matters in discussion were the vestments, liturgy, and oaths prescribed by law. When the Stuart dynasty took the throne, the harsh and cruel measures instituted compelled large numbers to leave the established Church, and worship in some other way. It then became necessary to adopt some form of Church organisation, and the question of Church government began to be agitated. These agitations developed the differences that existed among these primitive Puritans. In every great movement in history, there are two elements at work, corresponding with two great types of human character. There is the radical and destructive element, that seeks for a thorough and complete change in every thing, razing the building to the very foundation. There is also the moderate or conservative element, which seeks to remove only the defective portions of the building, and would retain as much as possible of the old in its construction of the new. These two elements

have appeared in every great revolution, and they manifested themselves among the Puritans. The first, or radical element, assumed the form of Independency, and although weak at first, like this element in every such movement, it gradually gathered strength by the simplicity of its principle, around which so many could rally. The second, or conservative element, assumed the form of Presbyterianism, and although strong at first, it gradually lost ground for the same reason that the other party gained it, the complexity of its principles requiring agreement on a greater number of points. These two parties united in resisting the tyranny of Charles, but they never agreed with each other. They were distinct in their origin, and in their subsequent history. The Presbyterian party was soon out-generalled by Cromwell and his adherents, and in the persecutions that followed the Restoration, was destroyed or absorbed into other forms of Church polity. The Independent, as soon as it arose, was transplanted to Holland, in part, whence a portion of it emigrated to New England in 1620, and founded New England Puritanism, whilst another portion either remained in, or returned to England, and succeeded in gaining the army in the civil war, established the Commonwealth, and became the ruling power in England for a time. This is the origin of Puritanism as it now exists in its living form in New England.

Presbyterianism in America had a different parentage, and one that is older than Puritanism by nearly a century. Presbyterianism, it is well known, was the form assumed by nearly all the Reformed churches of Europe that were allowed to act free from political influence. The French, Dutch, Swiss, Hungarian, and Scottish churches all adopted this form of polity. When they were persecuted at home, their fled to this country, and the French Presbyterians settled the Huguenot colonies of Virginia and South Carolina; the Dutch, those of New York and New Jersey, now represented by the Reformed Dutch of those States; but the great body of American Presbyterians have descended from the Scotch and Scotch-Irish, who were driven here by the tyranny of the Stuarts. This is a fact too familiar to require any proof.

Hence we see the difference of the two systems or facts, in their origin. Puritanism, as it exists here, was the transplanting of the Puritanism or Independency of England, Presbyterianism mainly of the Scotch and Scotch-Irish, as different an element from the other as the Celt from the Saxon. Puritanism was English, purely English, having all the features of that race whose history is so marked that he who runs may read it, and whose policy has been the same for generations that it is now, a policy which we forbear to discuss, or even to characterise. Puritanism is English character intensified by English tyranny, and transplanted to New England, there to enact a new chapter in the history of the great English race. Presbyterianism is Scotch and Scotch-Irish character, and has many of the features of that race that has been waging a war of resistance to English aggression from the days of Bannockburn, Dunbar, Ayrsmoss, and Londonderry, down to the exodus of the Free Church of Scotland; whose whole history has been one of struggle for Christ's crown and covenant; and who, if, as their enemies allege, they have hard and bitter elements of character, have had hard and bitter acts of oppression to develope them. Hence, whatever any one may think of these two things, they differ in their origin so that no one can fairly confound them with one another. Presbyterianism was an organised institution in Scotland a century before this existing form of Puritanism was born, and was as different from it in age, in origin, and in principle, as John Knox was from Oliver Cromwell.

We are aware that views somewhat different from these are extensively promulgated. It is asserted by many, and changes have been rung on the assertion in every form of utterance, that the great struggle which lately convulsed our country was only a renewal of the contest between the Puritan and the Cavalier, that the North is the embodiment of the spirit of the Puritan, whilst the South is that of the Cavalier, and that the English Cavalier is the father of all that is chivalric and heroic in the Southern character.

Against this assumption we enter our solemn protest, in the name of all history, as a cruel injustice to some of the noblest

names of the past. We do not desire to discuss the English Cavalier, or determine his precise place in history. But the simple truth is, that the English Puritan and the English Cavalier are both types of the same essential English character, and if we judge of both by their acts, either in the old world or in the new, either under Cromwell and the Charleses there, or under the men who burnt witches in Massachusetts, and those who fined and imprisoned Baptists and Presbyterians in Virginia, we prefer to have neither for our masters, for they have both been hard masters when they had the power. And as we protest against the Puritan assumption that he embodies all that is good at the North, so we protest against the Cavalier assumption that he embodies all that is good at the South, as specimens of the selfsame English spirit which can see nothing good in any direction that does not trace its origin to England.

By what right of historic truth is this assumption made for the English Cavalier? Were the Huguenots of Virginia English Cavaliers? And must we reckon as mere ciphers in the history of the Old Dominion that gallant band in whose baptismal registers we read such names as Maury, Fontaine, Lacy, Munford, Flournoy, Dupuy, Duval, Bondurant, Trent, Moncure, Ligon, Legrand, and others, whose living representatives remain to do honor to the memories of their fathers? Were these French Presbyterians nothing because they were not English Cavaliers? And shall we reckon for nothing that sturdy stream of Scotch-Irish, which, starting from Cumberland Valley in Pennsylvania, poured its conquering tide of hardy emigrants along the Valley of Virginia, westward to Tennessee and Kentucky, and eastward to the Carolinas and Georgia? Shall we ignore that living girdle of Presbyterian valor that stood "like a stonewall" between the howling savages and the settlements of Eastern Virginia; that furnished such men as Andrew Lewis and his contemporaries; that has furnished as much of eloquence and valor as any other race in our land, in the Prestons, McDowells, Breckinridges, Campbells, Shelbys, Seviers, Browns, Hoges, Waddels, and others; that has bequeathed some of the most honored names of the past and present; that poured

out its blood in every great battle-field of our land in both Revolutions; that has given to our annals such names as John C. Calhoun, Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, our own immortal Stonewall, and others, whose memory the world will not soon let die? Shall these men of West Augusta, where Washington had resolved to make his last stand for liberty, if defeated and driven from every other spot, shall they be held for mere ciphers because not English Cavaliers? Were the Scotch-Irish of North Carolina, who issued the Mecklenburg Declaration, and shed the first blood of the Revolution on the banks of the Alamance, ciphers? Were the Huguenots of South Carolina, who bequeathed to our history such names as Laurens, Marion, Horry, Manigault, and others, nothing, because not English Cavaliers? Were the Scotch-Irish of South Carolina, who sent to the field such elders as Pickens, Williams, and scores of others, and who sent even ministers from the pulpit who poured their blood on the battle-field in that great contest, ciphers, because not Cavaliers? And were the early settlers of Georgia, of the Gulf States, or the States of the South-west, either English Cavaliers or ciphers? Is it then fair to history, or fair to the memory of the heroic dead, to assign this monopoly of chivalry to the English Cavalier? Is it not rather a repetition of that same English spirit of boastful assumption, which, having made Plymouth Rock the blarney stone of the North, would rear a similar monument of self-laudation on the sands of Jamestown? Give, then, to Puritan and Cavalier their rightful due both of praise and of blame, as far as they deserve them. But let not the double injustice be done, that these assumptions undoubtedly do commit, of charging on the Presbyterian the sins of the Puritan, and decking the Cavalier with the hard-won honors of the Presbyterian. They all deserve both commendation and censure, for they were but fallible men. We do not pretend to assign their share to either class, but only affirm that the English Cavalier does not differ from the English Puritan by any broader line of blood or of race in his origin, than both differ from the Scotch, Scotch-Irish, and French Presbyterian, from whom have mainly come the Presbyterianism of this country.

When we come to trace these two systems in their developments, we shall find them as distinct in that development as they were in their origin. In the early struggles for religious liberty under the Stuarts, they were united, but never fully coalesced. About the beginning of the seventeenth century, a portion of the Independent party emigrated to Holland, where, encountering Dutch Presbyterianism, troubles ensued that hastened, if they did not cause, the departure of the Pilgrims to the New World. In England, this antagonism developed itself very early in the civil war that dethroned Charles. The Independents desired to make a radical reform, destroying most of the ancient institutions of England, whilst the Presbyterians wished to retain as many as possible. The Independents had a majority in the army, the Presbyterians in the Parliament. Cromwell succeeded in procuring the resignation of the great leaders on the other side, Essex, Warwick, Denbigh, and Waller, in the army, and then in purging the Parliament, until it was prepared for his purposes. Then the Parliament, under Independent control, beheaded Charles I., against the remonstrances of the Presbyterians, the ministers of London formally protesting against it. The Independents then placed Cromwell on the throne, and the Presbyterians proclaimed Charles II., and clung to him as long as his perfidy would permit them. It is well known that Cromwell hated the Presbyterians as much as he did the Prelatists, and shed nearly as much of their blood as he did of the Cavaliers. Prof. Palfrey, of Massachusetts, in his history of New England, (the latest and best work on that subject that has been issued,) says, vol. ii., p. 88, that "after the overthrow of the hierarchy, the Presbyterians were the conservative element of the kingdom;" and he traces in ampler detail than we have seen in any other author, the struggle between these two parties, and shows how intense and prolonged it became.

But as Mr. Palfrey well remarks, the true history of Puritanism must be sought in New England, and that is the history of the Independents, as distinguished from the Presbyterians. There the antagonism of two systems is strongly exhibited. In 1643, a few Presbyterians endeavored to obtain toleration in

Massachusetts for their views, but were fined and compelled to leave the country. A full account of the facts may be seen in Palfrey's work. Measures were then taken to crush out all attempts to introduce Presbyterianism, which were so successful that it has never since taken root on New England soil. It is a remarkable fact that, whilst other denominations have flourished there, there are not, even at this time, fifty Presbyterian churches in all New England, and they mainly in the Scotch and Scotch-Irish settlements, living like foreign exotics in an uncongenial soil and atmosphere.

Presbyterianism was planted in America about 1700, and an effort was made then to amalgamate these two systems. But they soon began to come into collision, and issued in the separation of 1740. After fifteen years of separation, the divided parts came together again, and a new effort at fusion was made about 1800, which, however, ended in the disruption of 1838.

As these statements may be questioned, we prefer to rest their proof on an authority that will probably be conceded as good on this question. The Rev. Joel Parker, D. D., of New York, in his history of the Presbyterian Church, written in 1844, (Rupp's Collections,) says, in speaking of the separation of 1838: "There were two parties in the Church. There always had been from the time that McKemie and his associates formed the Presbytery of Philadelphia, in 1705. The English Puritan and Scotch elements that were commingled in the (English) association formed between the Presbyterian and Congregational denominations, were transplanted into America. In this compound the Puritan influence was at first predominant. But a large share of the English immigration fell naturally into the Congregational churches of New England, while nearly all the Scotch as naturally dropped into the Presbyterian Church. Hence the Scotch element became more and more influential, as it came to bear a greater proportion to the whole body. Hence, too, the 'Old Side' and 'New Side;' and the division of 1740. These parties possessed, in their common symbols of faith, and in their common attachment to free, non-prelatical principles,

affinities of sufficient force to draw them together in some system of Christian co-operation. Yet there were differences which, like the repulsion existing between the particles of matter when brought near to one another, resisted any thing like a complete coalescence."

"The appellations 'Old Side' and 'New Side,' 'Old School' and 'New School,' have been justly complained of as an arrogant claim on the part of those terming themselves 'Old School,' and as evincing an attempt to cast odium upon their brethren, as having less reverence for Scriptural teaching, and the ancient paths of Christianity."

"The terms Scotch party, and Puritan party, cannot be reasonably objected to, because each party glories in its own ancestry in this respect."

Having thus laid down with such clearness and emphasis the existence of these two elements in the Presbyterian Church from its very foundation, Dr. P. then describes their characteristics in a paragraph, a few sentences of which may not be out of place in this connexion. He says: "The differences between these two parties in their native characteristics are pretty well understood. The Puritan is satisfied with maintaining the great leading truths of the Calvinistic faith, and is ready to waive minor differences, and to co-operate with all Christian people in diffusing evangelical piety."—"The Scotch, on the contrary, were of a more inflexible character. They, too, loved Calvinistic doctrines, and if they had less zeal than the Puritans in diffusing our religion, and in acting for the regeneration of our country and the world, they were second to no other people in these respects."

Without conceding the absolute accuracy of every statement made by Dr. Parker, the main fact is sufficient for our purpose. He affirms all that we contend for, that these two elements were antagonistic, that the attempt to amalgamate them in 1705, ended in the disruption of 1740; that the next great attempt to fuse them by the Plan of Union in 1801, resulted in the disruption of 1838; whilst the history of the Presbyterian Church in both of its great divisions since, presents a number of

facts too familiar to need repetition, that continue to evince this antagonism of principle existing in these two elements.

Thus the fact stands indelibly recorded in history, announced by Chief Justice Gibson in a celebrated legal opinion, that these two systems are "as immiscible as oil and water;" that from the rise of this type of Puritanism under Brown, Robinson, and the Pilgrim Fathers, more than two hundred years ago, in the old world and in the new, these two systems have never coalesced; and that therefore the man who in the face of all this continues to confound them, evinces ignorance, or something worse.

This antagonism is not a mere accidental thing, like the feuds of ancient times that were transmitted from sire to son without comprehending their nature. It exists in the essential principles of the two systems, so that when clearly apprehended and consistently carried out they cannot coalesce, any more than Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, or any other similar systems.

In speaking of the principles of these two systems, it must be remembered that they were more than mere forms of Church government, in their first operation. It was long after the Reformation that it was deemed necessary to separate Church and State, and hence, in the early history of nearly all the Reformed communities, there was a union more or less close of the political and religious elements that made them react on each other; so that their results were blended effects of both agencies. Puritanism in this respect had the great advantage of being removed to a new world, where it had the complete control of all its internal concerns, and could found a society on such principles as it thought right. This it did, especially in the Plymouth colony; for the early history of New England shows a difference between the Massachusetts type of opinion and practice, compared with that of Connecticut and Rhode Island, not very great, it is true, but perceptible, and a difference which may be traced to some extent for a long time in their history. If either must be selected as the purest type of Puritanism, it must be Massachusetts. This will probably be conceded by most intelligent New England men.

It must also be recollected that Puritanism in New England, in its first establishment, was not only a Church, but a State, a theocracy, in which the Bible was adopted as its code of laws, and all its civil and social institutions formed according to their conceptions of its teachings. Hence, what in another state of facts would have been merely a form of church government, became a mould for all social, civil, and political institutions, which naturally developed according to their original germ.

Presbyterianism never has had the same advantage precisely, even in Geneva or Scotland; for it has always been pressed by other systems, so as not to be able to develope itself as fully as Puritanism did in New England. But each had its clearly-defined principles, from which its history has flowed with more or less purity. We prefer to state these principles in the words of others, who cannot be suspected of framing them with any view of this argument, and shall therefore give them in the words of two able and distinguished writers, whose authority is above question.

Prof. Palfrey, (himself a Puritan,) in his history of New England, (vol. ii, p. 40,) in describing the system adopted by the Pilgrims, says, "It had no element of resemblance to presbytery or prelacy. It was pure democracy installed in ecclesiastical government." Such then was the essential principle of Puritanism.

Sir James Stephen, a member of the Church of England, in his Lectures on the History of France, p. 415, speaking of the Presbyterian system, as adopted by the Huguenots of France in 1559, says: "A great social revolution had thus been effected. Within the centre of the French monarchy, Calvin and his disciples had established a spiritual republic, and had solemnly recognised as the basis of it, four principles—each germinant of results of the highest importance to the political commonwealth. These principles were—first, that the will of the people was the one legitimate source of the power of their rulers; secondly, that power was most properly delegated by the people to their rulers, by means of elections, in which every adult man might exercise

the right of suffrage; thirdly, that in ecclesiastical government, the clergy and laity were entitled to an equal and co-ordinate authority; and fourthly, that between Church and State, no alliance, or mutual dependence, or other definite relation, necessarily or properly existed."

Here then, from sources that will not be questioned, are the differences in the essential elements of the two systems. The one is a pure democracy, like that of Athens, the other a representative republic. The one is a government of the existing numerical majority, whose decision is final; for Independency recognises no court of appeal that can reverse the action of the congregation. The other is a government of tribunals, with appellate courts above to correct the errors of the judicatories below. The one is a government of the individual will of the majority; the other, a government which necessarily involves a fixed and written constitution, by whose terms its complex system of tribunals is constructed. The one has not, and cannot have any fixed creed, as this would interfere with that liberty and responsibility of the individual will, which is its cardinal feature. The other has had from the beginning a fixed creed, whose leading articles of faith have changed but little since its first establishment. The one is mainly negative, denying much, but affirming little, as a system, leaving that to the individual. The other is positive, affirming more than it denies, and requiring assent to these affirmations as a condition of association with it. This feature had its origin in the facts that gave birth to the two systems; the ground of controversy in the one case being very narrow, only demanding a protest against certain features of the English Church; the other being much broader, as it was a conflict with the Church of Rome, covering the whole ground of the gospel.

Now the fact to which we call special attention is, that the one system, in its very structure, implies the fallibility and weakness of man, by making so many provisions to correct and restrain it, whilst the other does not. We believe that in this fact we find a germinant principle of great importance in the development of the two systems. The system which implies that man is a fallen,

fallible creature, needing restraints and correctives, even in his regenerate condition, requiring a system of checks and balances of the most guarded kind, will tend to produce a type of theology, philosophy, and individual character conformable to this idea. The system on the other hand, which is based on the opposite idea, implying that the depravity and feebleness of human nature is not such as to require such correctives, will tend to generate an opposite type of theology, philosophy, and personal character. And we need hardly state, that New England theology and philosophy have developed precisely in this direction: a fact which cannot be accidental, but seems thus to flow from the germinant idea of the Puritan system of Independency, when it is allowed to work itself out quietly and undisturbed by antagonistic influences. We need not dilate on this development, as it is familiar to every intelligent student of modern thought. So on the other hand the theology and philosophy of Presbyterian communities have developed exactly in the line of the germinant idea involved in its general system.

As to the type of personal character developed by the Puritan system, we prefer to present it as delineated by a Puritan hand, who does it with the most admiring love. Prof. Porter of Yale College, in his Premium Essay on the Puritan and Jesuit systems of education, thus delineates the Puritan who is the fair and legitimate development of the system, (p. 15):

"Puritanism did not spring into being at once, for it was not the device of man. It was developed by gradual advance, and a continuous growth, for it was the work of God. The movement commenced with the Reformation. * * The Lutheran, however, was not a Puritan. * * * The Huguenot was not a Puritan. * * * The English non-conformist was not wholly a Puritan, for he but half understood his own principles. * * * The New England pilgrim had not entirely worked out the problem of applying his master principles, nor did he fully understand the spirit he was of." "The freedom and independence of the individual man characterised the Puritan. * * * It was not however a lawless freedom, but a liberty implied in that separate responsibility

which each individual man holds to himself and to his God. The Puritan must judge of a law to know why he must obey it. No authority or organisation steps between himself and his conscience. Hence he stands or falls for himself; he is independent in his bearing, self-relying in his character, and marked by his own individuality. This, not because he scorns the restraints of society or of law, but because he is overmastered by a restraint that is higher; not that he despises authority, but that he reverences so deeply the authority that is highest of all. This feeling of responsibility leads him to a personal and thorough investigation, an investigation which is not content till it has tested every question at the highest tribunal. He calls in question every truth, not because he is sceptical by nature, but that he may distinguish the True from the False. He must examine all truth. He questions his own being, and powers of his own soul, the existence and character of God, the authority of conscience, the reason of this or that duty, the evidence of divine revelation, the genuineness of the text, the exactness of its meaning. He calls in question the tenure of magistrates, the right by which they bear the sword, and the use or abuse of power intrusted to their hands." "As the condition of man is ever changing, so in his view should organisations change. For this reason the Puritan believes in no fixed institutions to be retained as petrified memorials of the past, but in those which are ever growing into a more perfect life." "Hence is he by nature a reformer. He is intent upon changing old laws, old institutions, and old habits, that they may meet new exigencies, and new character of those for whose benefit they exist."

Without indorsing the absolute accuracy of this delineation in every particular, we may accept it as fair, and at least without any design to depreciate its subject. It then gives us the result of Puritanism as a mould of individual character, and through that, of social and civil life, and presents it as a system of Individualism. It seeks to cut the individual loose from all control of both Past and Present, that would trammel his will, and to exalt the personality to a position of paramount authority. It is the

rinciple of individual responsibility pushed to its utmost extreme. This principle is a vital one of Protestantism; but where it works unchecked, and in connexion with an implied theory of human nature that elevates its natural powers and goodness, it must lead to the rejection of much that is valuable in the opinions and institutions of the past, to an exercise of the liberty of private judgment that will generate endless diversities of opinion, and branch out into innumerable schools and *isms;* to an unsettled state of opinions in philosophy, religion, and politics; to a general drawing of every thing to the decision of the suffrage of the majority, and a popularising of every political and religious institution. This we find to be the fact in the religion, philosophy, and politics of New England, and of those communities in which New England influence prevails. It will also tend powerfully to develope individual energy, to produce a jealousy of individual rights, to promote popular education, and to stimulate popular advancement. Its grand defect is the lack of those checks, restraints, and elements of stability and permanence that are so needful in every enduring state of society, as all history teaches, and which, if furnished at all, must come from sources extraneous to the system itself. It is precisely here that it differs from Presbyterianism, which furnishes these conservative and restraining influences, and acts as a centripetal force to counteract the centrifugal tendency of the other system. Hence, whilst these two systems were antagonistic, they were not necessarily mutually destructive; and could that antagonism have been wisely adjusted and balanced, the result might have been a progress at once safer and faster than either could have produced if acting alone. Such has not however been the case, and the result has been evil.

But as our object is not so much to discuss either system, as to show that they were essentially different in their nature, we need not pursue this line of thought at any further length. Enough has been said, we presume, to convince every candid mind that these two systems differ as widely from each other as either of them differs from Episcopacy, or any other form of ecclesiastical government. Hence to confound them, as many

do, and to hold the one responsible for the acts, temper, and tendency of the other, is to evince a complete ignorance of both that disqualifies for any intelligent judgment.

Having endeavored thus to show this difference, we are now at liberty, in conclusion, to rebuke some of the denunciations of Puritanism that are occasionally met with in public and private. In many cases, it is a secret dislike of that earnest, faithful piety that is thought to be identified with Puritanism, and a covert utterance of the malign feelings of infidelity. In other cases, it is a sectarian trick, that would disparage one set of religionists by the abuse of another, supposed to be nearly related to them, and thus exalt its own party or sect. In other cases, it is a sheer ignorance of the whole matter, and the adoption of catch-words and names, the meaning of which is not understood. The primitive Puritanism of England was not a faultless thing, but had some defects that may easily be seen and easily caricatured. But that man knows little of the history of English and American liberties who does not know that we owe them largely to the courage, sufferings, and endurance of the early Puritans. And whilst we are disposed to believe that had the Presbyterian party retained the final ascendancy instead of the Independent under Cromwell, the history of that great struggle might have been so different that the Restoration would not have been demanded by the English people, yet it is very certain that we owe to the Puritans of Cromwell a debt of gratitude that the world has been reluctant to pay. Had the Cavalier party succeeded in completely crushing their opponents, as they desired, and a Stuart dynasty been fastened upon England, the history of the last two hundred years had been a very different one, and one that no friend of civil or religious liberty can regard with any satisfaction. Hence to load the early Puritans with indiscriminate abuse, as is so often done, is to evince either an ignorance of the history of the past, or a feeling that is still more blameable. And in regard to the modern Puritans, whilst we have yet graver objections to urge against them than can be brought against the original Puritans, we apprehend that but little will be gained in dealing with them

by blind and indiscriminate abuse, such as that to which we have adverted.

There are many points that we have omitted, or touched but lightly in this investigation, which a fuller discussion of either system considered apart, would have brought out more fully. Our object has been mainly to show the falsehood of much of the current cant, and some of the sectarian tricks of the present time, and to furnish hints for a fuller investigation. There is a wide and deeply interesting field of examination in regard to the effect of forms of Church polity, especially when closely connected with civil and political institutions, on the development of theology, philosophy, social and individual character, that is almost unexplored, and which yet awaits a master pen for its complete elucidation. If any hints we have given shall turn those who are capable of such investigations to this field, it will unfold the true philosophy of history concerning many facts with which we have to do at this time, as no other line of exploration will be able to do, and will add a contribution of inestimable value to our general literature. We hope that some able hand, having the requisite leisure, may do it for these two great phenomena in modern history, the Puritanism of old and New England, and the Presbyterianism of France, Switzerland, Hungary, Holland, Scotland, and America.

ARTICLE II.

SAINT PAUL'S VISION OF VICTORY.

In such times as those in which we live, greater supports than ordinary are required by the children of God. And those greater than ordinary supports are provided for them in the treasures of the divine word. They enjoy those supports in proportion as those treasures of the rarer and richer and more

recondite descriptions, are unlocked to them by a providence, a prayer, an experience, a beam of the illumining power of the Spirit of the Lord, however or whenever imparted.

We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. It is not asserted that all things, in all their workings, especially in their separate workings, promote the good of the elect. For then there would be nothing with which to wage a conflict, nothing over which to be conquerors. But it is asserted that all things, considered as in co-operation and concert, promote the good of God's chosen people. Each of the individual things which are enumerated—tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, sword—is an evil thing in and of itself. But as these things are embraced in the great scheme of redemption, as they take place in a world which is not an orphan and atheist world, but is governed by the sovereign power of God; and as they have all been touched by that controlling power of God which is exerted because there is a scheme of redemption, and whose purpose and object is that all things shall bend to that scheme of redemption, therefore, contrary to their original and direct nature, these things work together for good to the lovers of God.

There is another list of things, not in their nature friendly: death, life, angels, principalities, powers, things present, things to come, height, depth, and every other creature. This latter list includes the former, and much more besides. The former was a muster-roll of enemies upon the arena of time, and of things seen and temporal. The latter is intended to bring together into the sublime vision, all things which may affect the destinies of an immortal soul. The former things—tribulation, persecution, peril—may be regarded as specifications under the head of one or two of the latter—life, death. And the grandeur of the victory will begin to appear, if it be true that the second list is a list of heads, each containing many particular things, over which God's people shall triumph by God's blessing. The former, or particular list, is a list of positive foes. The latter is a far deeper and grander list of things in which the sirens of

temptation dwell. In the first place, the apostle exhibits the march of the power of God through all human destinies: For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. Here is a chain which runs from before the foundation of this world, till after the termination of this world: from foreknowledge, before the process of human salvation began, to glory eternal, after the process of human salvation shall be consummated in heaven. It bears a light along all the paths of salvation, in company with those whom God foreknew, going with them through the intermediate stages of appointment to conformity with Christ, of effectual calling, of justification, and thence to that final victory and glory, which it is the main object of the context to foreshow. And it substantially affirms that they are the same persons who go through all these successive gates, one after the other, on the way to heaven. Every succeeding process is affirmed concerning those who were the objects of the immediately preceding process. It attends all who enter, all the way; and affirms them, at every step, to be the same persons whom we just before saw at the earlier stage. It is a great misfortune to any soul to be trained to feel prejudice against these teachings of God's word. Some think the true reading is, "predestinate conformed to the image of his Son." They say that the verb "to be" is in italics in the English Bible; and that that shows it is not in the original. And it is true that the words "to be" are not in the original. But it is a mere grammatical ellipsis, which the English translators have supplied with entire propriety. It is hardly to be supposed that any mind which undertakes faithfully to interpret Holy Scripture, could be satisfied with saying that men are predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ, after they have already been so conformed. That is a post-destination; and a contradiction in terms. If it be further alleged that men are predestinated to salvation after they are conformed to the image of the Son of God, it is replied, *first*, that the power

which conforms them to Christ, is expressly placed after predestination: "Whom he did predestinate, *them* he called and justified." It is replied, *second*, that a predestination after conformity, begins *in the middle*, where it ought not to begin; and not *at the beginning*, where it ought to begin, and the true does begin. And it is replied, *thirdly*, that it is impossible to show how the elect became conformed to the image of Christ, before they were justified. Such a thing is not in Saint Paul's statement of the processes of salvation. It is a mere evasive expedient, and does not require further attention. It is a part of some other strange gospel.

Now, all these processes in the work of man's salvation are distinctly attributed to God himself. He foreknew them. He predestinated them. He called them. He justified them. He glorified them. The chain is as distinctly "bound around the throne of the Eternal" as language can bind it. That is not all. The eternal God is represented not only as having hold of the chain at that end which runs back into the gray abyss of the past, but as taking hold of it anew at every step. He is present to give the call, the justification, and the glorification. He attends as a present God all along the line of the career of his people. This is indeed a very pure ecclesiasticism. We do not have to search for divine authority, by supposing the validity of doubtful acts, through dark and distant ages; or to reach the ratifying hand of the Lord by relying on the most complete of earthly uncertainties; or to trust in traditions, ordinations, and successions, for eighteen hundred years, in a chain very often dipped in the deepest moral depravity of Christendom. But the Spirit of God is the living and present executor of affairs in his own Church. He is a present and not an absent God. The grace displayed in calling, justifying, and sanctifying sinners, is immediately from God at every step, and is invested with direct and immediate divine authority. He calls. He justifies. He glorifies. The theory of derivation by succession is a mummy which men assert to have been a living being in the days of the apostles. The Church system of the Scriptures is a life, a soul, a spirit, the breath of the Spirit of God, at the present time.

Now the plain reason why all things work together for good to them that love God, is, that all things have been, by heavenly hands and heavenly power, wrought into the scheme of salvation, from the early aurora of foreknowledge, to the full meridian of ultimate glory. Many things are in their nature inimical to the lovers of God. In the Old Testament, and in the New, it is written, and the children of God have often had to take up the lament, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. As fearful a thing as it is, and as luridly as the light of heaven, and the eyes of the Lord Jesus Christ, will one day flash upon it, yet it is a thing sometimes done upon that earth upon which Christ died that man might live, that those who love him are killed for his sake. And it is because the course of this world is, in and of itself, opposed to the Lord Jesus. Else, without an enemy, there could not be that VICTORY of which he afterwards speaks. But that power of God which conducts the work of salvation, and upholds the frame of nature till redemption be completed, is laid upon all things. Christ is head over them all to the Church. The Spirit of God lays his power upon them every one, and safely leads every one of his children through them all. The power which the divine Spirit throws over them, is as all-embracing as the great magnetic currents of the earth, or as the currents of gravitation through the universe. It is a universal providence, causing all things to work together for good to them that love God. It is also a particular providence attending the fall of a sparrow, the decoration of the lilies of the field, and the winter repasts of the birds of the air. In its vastness, it measures and maps out the dizzy tract of Oriental history, sketching and figuring, under emblems of the different parts of a man's body, or different wild beasts rising from the sea, the Assyrian, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman ages. It sings the "burdens" of Babylon, of Damascus, of Egypt, and of Tyre; the "dooms" of Dumah, and Ariel, and the crown of pride, and the land shadowing with wings. In its minuteness, it touches the shaking of a viper from his arm by the apostle Paul, and the leaving of a cloak and some parchments at Troy, and

his vision of a shadowy and beckoning man of Macedonia, inviting him to Europe. In its vastness, it comprehends the series of seals, and trumpets, and vials of the Apocalypse "dark with brightness all along," disclosing the destinies of modern nations, till the new Jerusalem descends from God out of heaven, as a bride adorned for her husband.

The scheme of redemption commenced at the very beginning—"before the foundation of the world." The power of God has therefore from the beginning been laid upon all things, even those most hostile to grace and to God, in a most wise and powerful bounding, ordering, and governing them, in a manifold dispensation, depriving them, or any of them, of any power, when they touch the scheme of redemption, to alter or abolish, to destroy or to harm it in any wise whatever.

All gloom, all despondency, all unbelief are in their nature atheistic. The spell and charm from God compelling things which would otherwise be adverse, to work together for good to them that love him, must embrace all things, if it embrace any thing, because it is from God himself. He announces himself every where in nature, by wonderful fitnesses, and adjustments, and adaptations of moral and material things, which seem to say he was here but now, and is just gone away. Rhythmic numbers, and measured proportions, and laws which almost speak his name aloud, announce him every where. The traces of his hand in nature are forever fresh and recent. He wrought yesterday, he will work to-night in silence. The intelligent eye to-morrow will

> Through worlds and races and terms and times,
> See musical order, and pairing rhymes.

This universal presence and power of God is on behalf of his people wherever it appears. And if God be for us, who can be against us? If, then, this is no atheistic world, howling fatherless through its annual orbit, and if the power of God is both general and special, vast and minute, and if the traces of the presence of God are as clear and legible in men's spiritual histories, and experiences, and inner life, as they are in the

material world, who and what is the other power, of which we are to be afraid, finding it to be against us?

Three things appear as possible evils. First, the failure of the gifts of God to the souls of his chosen people—such gifts as may be needed, and on the occasions on which they are needed. But all probability that gifts will be withheld, is forever removed by the fact that the greatest of all gifts has already been bestowed: He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? A second possible evil is the falling of the elect into new condemnations as they go through the deep waters of this life. This is met by the fact that, in the plan of justification brought to light in the gospel, the justifying act is an act of God: Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? And the third possible evil is that at some critical period of our existence, and of our trials, and of our soul's need, it may come to pass that there shall be found to be in heaven no one to intercede with the Disposer of events on our behalf. But the Intercessor is immediately exhibited, and the path which he trod through the grave and the resurrection, to reach his place above: It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

If God has given his own Son to die for us, if God has provided the means of justifying sinners by the precious blood of Jesus, if he has raised Jesus triumphantly from the tomb, if he has exalted him to the place of power at his own right hand in the heavenly places, to be the perpetual and divine High-priest interceding for his people, how can it be for a moment supposed that with Christ, he will not also freely give us all things? He has given us the great propitiatory sacrifice,—his own Son,—to justify us; will he withhold from us grace to continue in a justified state? He raised Christ from the dead by his mighty power; will he withhold from us the same mighty power to raise us to newness of life in Christ Jesus? He has exalted our divine Redeemer to be also our perpetual Intercessor; will he let that Intercessor plead in vain, when asking for that very grace

to be faithful, which is the thing we chiefly need? How can it be for a moment supposed, that having delivered up his own Son, having made that Son a victim of the law, and for a time the subject of even ghastly death itself, and then having recognised that Son as lawful Intercessor above, he will withhold from those who are chosen in the Son, awakening grace, grace to believe in Christ, self-denying grace, persevering grace, grace sufficient for them through life, and grace for the final victory over all enemies?

What has already been done in pursuance of the wonderful plan, clearly shows how certain to be done is that part of it which as yet we see not, which is hidden by the veil of mortality that dims our sight, and which yet remains to be done. But we are not to be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease; not to be translated to heaven from the castle of indolence; not to make our way to unspeakable glories, without great struggles; not to go from a flower-garden, but from a battle-field; nor from the piping times of peace, but from fierce spiritual wars, hardly-fought fields, and divinely-bestowed victories. The lovers of God have always met with opposition in the world: "As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." The quotation comes from a psalm which throws into light from the golden days of the fathers of old the memorable fact that they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them, but thy right hand, and thine arm, and the light of thy countenance, because thou hadst a favor unto them. It is not to be pretended that it is a good thing in itself, to be accounted as sheep for the slaughter, or to be killed all the day long; or that tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword, are in themselves things either good or friendly to the children of God. Nor is it to be pretended that death and life, and angels and principalities and powers, and things present and things to come, and height and depth, have no tendency in themselves to separate us from the love of God; or that victory is easy, and can be won by any unaided arm that ever lived. But the precise thing that is said, is that a secret

omnipotence proceeds from God, and flows over all things, and among all things, and through all things, depriving each of them severally, or all of them together, of all power whatever, to separate a single soul from the love of God; and confirming our souls into a thorough and complete certainty on this great point by a consideration of all the grand facts already recited, and already having occurred, by the extreme preciousness of the gifts already bestowed, and the manifest purpose of the divine mind to give the plan of salvation a thorough and complete execution. In all things we are to obtain the VICTORY. We are indeed to be MORE THAN CONQUERORS; not indeed through our own strength, but through Him that loved us, and through that secret exercise of omnipotence, every where, over all things, depriving them of the power to separate us from Christ, or, in their combined result, to produce any thing else but our good.

DEATH separates us forever from the prizes and treasures of this world; separates us from the love of living men, even those who have been dearest to us in this life; separates, for a time, our very souls from our bodies. At first view, it looks as if it separated us from every thing; as if it entirely terminated our being; as if it cut us sheer off from all work, device, knowledge, or wisdom; as if it sent us irrevocably into the hideous kingdom of nothingness. Sometimes he is a fearful dragon, having a sting; sometimes he is a warrior-knight, riding on a horse of paleness; sometimes the king of all ghastly terrors, which stride in gloom and darkness around the gate of departing human life. But the dragon with the sting, the pale warrior-knight, the king of terrors, is restrained by the power of God from separating a single soul of one of God's chosen people from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Such is the uttered word of God; and the facts sustain it fully. The love of God in the soul, is stronger than death or the grave. We are told that if we believe not that Jesus is the great Anointed One, we shall die in our sins. Death, then, will not separate between our souls and their sins. Death will no more separate the saints from the love of God. Death never does separate the soul from its own moral character. When we come to look a second time,

and more attentively, at death, the first appearance, as if it separated us from every thing, has changed. Sometimes people meet death in deep, submissive tranquility. Sometimes they are overawed by their approach to the pure and holy majesty of God. Sometimes they are quite absorbed with the splendor and glory of visions which they seem to behold somewhere near to them. Sometimes they look forward, and cry, "Glory!" Sometimes they say, "O how beautiful!" The love of God is *in the soul.* Its seat is in the immortal part of the nature of man. And it is not the soul which is dying. It is only the dissolution of the bond which binds the soul to flesh and blood which is taking place. The soul is "secure in her existence." She turns away from earthly things, springs across the fearful abyss, clears the congregation of the dark and shadowy terrors on the shore, attains the shore of the better land, and has borne with her the love of God as a part of herself. There is nothing like separation. That love is the moving principle which leads her bravely, cheerfully, hopefully, joyfully on. The visions of the high, eternal shore, of the pure, perfect, and immortal forms of things, and of the holy and eternal lights that sleep on things in that world, make the love of God doubly precious, pure, and strong. Dragon with the fiery, envenomed sting! most terrible of things which are feared among men! in every such scene thou art vanquished! The children of God are more than conquerors over thee, through that Son of God who is also Son of man. Thou goest forth, no doubt, conquering and to conquer those who obey not the gospel of Christ. But among the chosen of God, thou goest not forth any longer thus. Thy sting, O fiery dragon, has been extracted. Thy crown, king of terrors, is faded. Thy form is dim; thine own countenance pale. Among those who are the called according to God's holy purpose, thou canst do no mighty works. Thou mayst dissolve, for a while, the mystical union between soul and body, for that is a union in material nature; but thou canst not separate a single soul from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. For that is another mystical union of a higher, purer nature; of which one party is divine, and of which the other party, though in

themselves mortal and perishing, are no victims of death, because they are "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." And there, around the bed of the dying saint, where the eyes of carnal men see nothing but thee, Pale Rider, there indeed, art thou conquered, and more than conquered, by the overleaping love which binds the redeemed soul to its Redeemer.

Nor shall LIFE be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Of course, life embraces tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, and peril. And these things include hours of very sore temptation. But life also fairly embraces temptations of the opposite description, times of temptation from prosperity, as well as from adversity. Life embraces times of smooth sailing, happy auspices, abundance of the good things of this world, good name, and high and unassailable immunity from peril. And these things are often found to be even less friendly to the love of God than tribulation, and distress, and peril. It is on this side probably that life includes the keenest temptations. But on this side, life will not be able to separate us from the love of God. For, if we consider God's plan from of old to save his chosen people; if we look at what has already been done; if we consider what a gift it was when God freely delivered his Son up for us all; what a power it was which he exercised when he raised up Christ from the dead, and what a grant it was to the cause of his redeemed people when he set up Christ on the right hand of the majesty on high, ever to live as our Friend, our Advocate, our Intercessor, we must come to the conclusion from consistent reasoning, to which we are here brought by this authority of the inspired word, that even life, on its fair side, will not prevail to undo us. It must be plain to every understanding how unsound it is, and how frivolous, to tell us here that life and death cannot separate us from the love of God, but that we can separate ourselves; that these things cannot separate us, *if we remain faithful;* but that these things will separate, if we are not ourselves faithful. But that is the very question in hand, whether we ourselves shall be faithful. That is the only matter of any importance on the subject. To make the apostle leave that point, of our own

fidelity, out of view, is to accuse him of empty and tantalizing nonsense. Every one sees at once that that is the very point aimed at all through the chapter—that point that the carnal mind is enmity to God, and is not subject to his law, neither indeed can be; and so could not remain in subjection and persevere in that state, if it were even once in it. But that the spiritual mind is a different thing; has the Spirit of God dwelling in it; has within a source of life; is led by the Spirit of God; is an heir of God; has the Spirit to bear witness within it; and to intercede for it with unutterable groanings. The very leading and grand idea of the whole passage is, that the true child of God is so much under divine influence in every way, that he does not desire to separate himself from the love of God, and that nothing can separate him, against his own will, and against God's will. What can be said on the other side? Does that powerful arrangement to save souls, planned before the foundation of the world as a remedy for the fall of man, fail after all to embrace the main thing, that is, the grace to keep man's heart and will true and faithful to God? Is the very point of danger—our own fidelity—mockingly and derisively left unguarded? Has God, in the treasures of his gifts, no grace to "make and keep us pure *within?*" Can Christ's intercession bring down no help for the inner man, that we may persevere? Can not God himself lead us freely along the whole of the narrow way? Is the certainty of his perpetual and eternal holiness any cause to call in question the freedom of the will of the Son of God?

To every one of these questions the answer is entirely clear. The powerful arrangement to save souls, planned before the foundation of the world as a remedy for the fall of man, does *not* fail, after all, to embrace the main thing, which the mutability of Adam and Eve in Paradise shewed to be the main thing, namely, grace to keep man's heart and will true and faithful to his God. The very point of danger, the fidelity of the renewed heart, is *not* mockingly and derisively left unguarded and unprovided for. The treasures of the divine grace embrace this grace chiefly and specially, the grace to make us pure within,

that is, regeneration,—and the grace to keep us pure within, that is, sanctification and perseverance. Christ's intercession for us, has for its object this point chiefly, as it is personal love, and not a mere abstract love. Clearly, God can and does lead us freely along the whole journey of the narrow way, our preservation from falling being in a rational course, and by the use of means. And clearly, no beings in the universe can be more perfectly free of will than the adorable Son of God, and the spirits of just men made perfect in heaven, though they are absolutely under the full and undisputed dominion of holiness, and purity, and love, and are absolutely and forever secure from falling into sin.

Many-sided Form, who lookest every way, and goest every where, basking in every mild sunbeam, cooling thyself in every fragrant west wind, sitting round every fireside, trampling with thick-falling step every crowded city, sailing in every sea-going vessel, holding consultation in every council chamber, shouting upon every battle-field, mistress of a thousand curious arts, possessor of all terrestrial secrets, traveller in all human pathways, LIFE! where goest thou, or where goest thou not, to work? Thou spreadest temptations for the children of God on earth, at sea, in air, in the stars, in the realms of nature, in those of thought, and in those of imagination. Thou temptest men from early dawn to the late hours of night, by the light of the sun, and by that of the moon and stars, in the outward and in the inward world, by the appetites, the passions, and the reason. Thou streamest in all thy carnal power down the currents of this world. Thou hast a charm for souls whose depth outmeasures all earthly things. But work where and as thou wilt, Life, thou wilt be able to separate not a single one of the chosen children of God from the love that is in Christ Jesus.

Having taken the measure of our earthly existence in one of its dimensions—life and death—the apostle next looks through the separating veil which interposes between us and the spirits in the immutable and eternal state. Nor angels nor principalities nor powers shall be able to separate us. Neither shall the angels of common rank and dignity; nor those whose more exalted nature

and gifts have invested them with positions as conspicuous as principalities among men; nor those who "excel in strength" by the possession of divinely given powers. Holy angels do not desire to accomplish such a fearful purpose, for it is they in whose presence in heaven there is joy over one sinner that repenteth. Neither shall the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, and who now roam this world seeking to devour souls, be able to separate the children of God from the love of God. Some of these fallen spirits must still be very powerful. No doubt they lost, by their sin and fall, much of that pure immortal vigor which moral rectitude had given them. They have lost much of the force of nerve and power of wing with which a sound conscience endowed them; much of that high and dauntless moral courage which the light of God's countenance bestowed. But the word of God represents them to be still foes, not to be despised for skill, ingenuity, and daring. One of them is called the god of this world. Another, or the same, is spoken of as the prince of the power of the air. Others still, as principalities, powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, spiritual wickednesses in high places. They deceived and ruined Adam and Eve, and with them their posterity. They pushed and inflamed the world before the flood to such a pitch of wickedness as to bring down that awful perdition of the flood upon them. They drove guilty Sodom on to its fiery doom. They disputed with Michael the archangel about the body of Moses, probably with the design of corrupting many generations of the Hebrew people with the idolatry which would proceed from haunting the shrine where the ashes of the great lawgiver were interred. They stood at the right hand of high-priest and prince, in the days of old, to resist him when he interceded for the people. They sorely pierced David's soul with sin. They dragged down Solomon's glory into grievous darkness. With ever-ready foot and willing wing, they rioted in the chambers of the souls of such priests as Hophni and Phinehas, such kings as Jeroboam and Ahab. They hurled the chosen people into captivity. They filled the air, in those dull ages which rolled away between the two

Testaments, with the clash of swords and the clank of fetters. Seven of them beclouded and poisoned the soul of one woman of Magdala. A legion poured themselves into the afflicted spirit of a man of Gadara. Abroad over the earth they revelled in the spiritual ruin of the soul of man. The demon of lust inflamed souls in the high places of idol religion, and on the thrones of kings. The demon of murder danced in the abundance of assassinations, conspiracies, and proscriptions. The demon of ambition bade the drum beat and the trumpet sound to arms over the civilised world. When Christ came, they assaulted him with deep and fiery temptations, in all probability much more real and sharp than a cursory reading of the narrative supposes. One of the apostles falls temporarily under Satan's sifting power. Another of them tells us that we need the whole armor of God to encounter these spiritual wickednesses. He enumerates the girdle of truth, and the breast-plate of righteousness, the shoes of the preparation of the gospel of peace, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the sword of the Spirit, and then all prayer and supplication in the Spirit. And this great array of spiritual weapons, and the midnight anxieties, and the noonday doubts, and the protracted conflicts of many a soul, show the combat to be a fearful reality. It is a great wonder that these mighty and malicious beings are not able to separate the children of God from his love, by some ingenious device, some cunning plot, some artful contrivance stretching from age to age, some transformation of fiends into angels of light, some inflaming of the carnal nature of man into open hatred of all holy things, some deep moral intoxication of a whole race, some fearful blinding of the eyes of a whole generation to truth, duty, right, holiness, justice, humanity. But they are not able to do so. The children of God who may be found to exist among all doomed races, at the pouring out of all vials of doom, will find all the applicable promises fulfilled to them in every time of trial. The reason is, that a scheme was laid before the foundation of the world for their salvation. An omnipotence which touches all things, every where, executes that scheme. When wrapped in the folds of that omnipotence, all

things work together for their good. And if it be denied that such a holy, wise, and powerful bounding and governing of all things, in all their workings, so as to keep them within limits, to deprive them of power to hurt the security of his people, and to cause them to work together in their final result, for the good of the chosen, is a legitimate part of omnipotence; it may be replied that, without such power, he would neither be supreme as Prophet, as Priest, or as King; nor supreme in the natural, or in the moral, or the spiritual universe.

Next we have another measure of our whole being, by another of its dimensions: Nor shall things present, nor things to come be able to separate us. In the category of time, all things for us are comprehended in the past, the present, and the future. The past did not separate us from the love of God. It brought us into it. In the past, God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. In the past, Christ died and rose again. In the past, Christ ascended up to his place of intercession on high. In the past, we were appointed to salvation, called, and justified. In the past, the apostle had had, and we have had, many sharp tribulations which did not separate us from the love of God. In the past, life, and angels, and principalities, and powers, and all of every category that had any foothold in the past, did not separate us. The past, then, contains only auguries of good. It has witnessed the extinction of the hopes of many a mere professor of religion. But it has never witnessed the separation of the soul of one single true child of God from the love of God. It has witnessed their being foreknown, their election, their justification, their conformity to Christ. There is the same reason for hoping and believing that we shall persevere in the future, as there was for such a hope when the past was future. Nothing but the grace of God has kept us faithful to our God and to ourselves heretofore. There is that same power promised and pledged to us, for that same thing hereafter. If it has been adequate heretofore, where is the ground on which it can be expected to prove inadequate hereafter? The opinion of one great and influential leader of opinion, on this chapter of the Romans, is this: "The whole of

the preceding discourse will show that every thing here is *conditional*, as far as it relates to the ultimate salvation of any person professing the gospel of Christ; for the promises are made to *character*, and not to persons, as some have most injudiciously affirmed."* If it be true that every thing here is conditional, as far as it relates to the ultimate salvation of any person professing the gospel of Christ, if there be no promise to Christians personally, that they shall have grace to be faithful to the end, then it is probable that the eye which does not see such a promise here, does not see such a promise any where. Then, according to that view, there is no such promise of our persevering in the love of God, any where to be found in Scripture. If, then, these promises are conditional, the condition on which they depend is to be performed by the human will, unaided by a promise, or by grace conferred according to a promise. Then "the ultimate salvation of any person professing the gospel" depends on a capricious, or accidental, exercise of the human will, which no promise can reach, no gift of grace can touch, no divine omnipotence can secure. And if this conditional scheme were true, this very passage of Scripture, of all others, is rendered senseless and nugatory; for the great object of this passage is the security of believers. What a great parade the apostle is making on the subject of the security of believers here, according to this scheme of interpretation, when, after all, their security depends on things not here alluded to! In fact, the whole goes to show that every thing here is *unconditional*, as far as it relates to the ultimate salvation of every true child of God. The promises are *not* made to *character*, but directly to persons. If they were made to character, they would be of no avail to any Christian to assure him that God's grace would help him to be faithful. But that is obviously the chief aim of the passage. The evidences that these promises are personal, and not to *character*, appear all along the current of the discourse. The persons intended in it, are those who truly profess Christ, and not those who make an empty profession. They are called

* Dr. Adam Clarke.

"them that love God, who are called according to his purpose;" "those whom he foreknew;" "those whom he predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son;" "those whom he justified;" "those whom he glorified;" "God's elect;" "us" who are inseparable from the love of God. A mere unconverted "professor of the gospel of Christ," has no promise at all, in this or any other connexion that we know of, in the Scriptures. A true child of God has in this place the most positive, personal, and unconditional promises of victory over all enemies. And a species of divine grace which is unable to keep the children of God faithful to the end, is not that grace which is the subject of this passage. It is not the grace of any of the promises. It is not the grace which we need in the conflict of life. It is not the grace promised in the inspired word of God. It is not the grace whose promise is cheering to the tried believer. It is not the grace which Christian hearts universally seem taught of God to expect at the throne of grace, and for which they all ask at that throne.

So we may stand within the door of the present, and look out upon the whole fearfully seething and boiling springs, and fountains, and currents of things to come, and retain our full persuasion that things to come will not be able to separate us from the love of God. And the reason is, not that things to come are any more friendly to the children of God, in their intrinsic nature, than the things past were; but that the secret omnipotence of God, in pursuance of a very ancient, and very deliberately formed, and very sublime plan in reference to the elect, has touched the things to come, as it has all other created things, and taken away their power to turn away the hearts of the children of God from the love of God. And that their election is long before *character;* that *character* proceeds from election, in fact; as well as for other ideas advanced here by the apostle, we have at least one very conclusive testimony from the lips of our blessed Lord himself: "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither

shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."* None but a prophet's vision can see things to come, in all the various and unexpected forms and shapes which they may wear, when they shall arrive at their existence and due place within the bounds of time and space. And it was a problem to be solved by the Divine mind itself alone, what should be the effects of things to come upon the perseverance of the children of God in his love. But it is by the sovereign omnipotence of God over all things, that power is taken from them to overcome the children of God. And it is by the unsearchable omniscience of God, exercising itself in the most immense, yet the most minute, the most wide and general, yet the most special and particular of all the deeds of the providence of God ever foretold on the pages of prophecy, that that future restraining omnipotence of God over all future things is here announced. Not one single child of God is ever to be beguiled away from his love, either at murderous Jerusalem, or at beautiful Damascus, or at shrine-worshipping Ephesus, or suicidal Phillippi, or at learned Athens, or at elegant Corinth. Unknown strange things to come, shall not prevail with a single soul, brought to Christ by me, Paul; or one brought to him by any other of the apostles of the Lord; or one brought to him by his ministers of any other age; over none brought to him in these eastern climes, and realms, and places; and over none brought to him in any other climes, realms, or places.

After that view of our nature which lies in the category of existence, as death and life; that view comprised in the category of the influence of superior orders, as angels, principalities, and powers; and that view expressed in the category of time, as things present and things to come; there is, to be perfectly exhaustive, another still, the category of position, of elevation or depression, of high or low: Neither height nor depth shall be able to separate us from the love of God.

It may be that the language is primarily strictly physical and

---

* John 10: 26–29.

material. But it is natural to think of man's spiritual prosperity, his wearing of the robes of the imputed righteousness of Christ, his procession through deliverances, and triumphs, and divinely bestowed glories, as above the earth, as pictured and resplendent in the height above, as things with which the realms of light are yet to be figured and adorned. And if any of the triumphal processions, and gorgeous visions of the Bride of the Lamb, arrayed in white, should be permitted, even then, just before the day of judgment, to draw us away from the love of God, vain would be all the past scenes which that love had given us eyes to behold.

It is natural to think of final doom as in the depths below. There would be fearful visions to be seen in the abyss, day by day, had we eyes which were not fettered by the laws of the material world. The tumblings of guilty souls into ruin, the wailings of the spirits in prison, the lurid atmosphere, and the hideous forms of that world,—of which this world may be something of a type, in those years and months when battle, and malice, and rapine, and desolation reign in it—might peradventure separate us from reason, and sanity, and the love of God at once, if they were not now hidden from our view. And if the chariot which shall bear our spirits up to God, shall, in its final exode from this world, go in sight of those fearful scenes of the abyss, it is not in vain that a promise from God should span that abyss also: That depth shall not separate us from the love of God.

If height be such a power in the government of God, as that which once caught the apostle to the Gentiles up to the third heavens, to hear unutterable things, and to be puffed with spiritual pride; or if depth be such a power as plunges men's spirits down, from day to day, to converse with gloomy forebodings, and to walk with the damned in imagination, or to try in vain the power of a mortal mind to endure "the eternal blazon" of that dark world: neither shall be able to separate one single one of the children of God from his love. And no other creature shall be able to effect that separation, because he that appointed them to salvation, and who called them here

below, and spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for them all, and who justifieth them, and has in many ways expressed his purpose to glorify them, is the eternal God, out of whose hands nothing can pluck them.

There is a custom much in vogue on some occasions, of throwing off the whole authority of these things as being in the revealed word of God, by saying that they are contradictory to other Scriptures. The Scriptures to which they are said to be contrary are such as this: Whosoever will, let him come, and take the water of life freely. The plain inference is that the objector thinks the divine Spirit *did very wrong* in revealing both predestination and free will. And had he been such a spirit as that of the objector, he would not probably have revealed both these two things as he has done. Now, either the divine Spirit has inspired men to write contradictory things, one of which is necessarily false, or else they are not contradictory. But the only thing the objector has a right to say, is that these things do not appear to him to be reconcilable. Of course what *appears to him* to be reconcilable, and *what is* reconcilable, are not always the same thing. The plain truth of the matter is that the decrees or purposes of God embrace the acts of man's free will. Those acts are parts of God's decrees. That is the way in which the Scriptures treat them. That is the clear and proper philosophy of the subject. They are the links in the chain of appointed events in human life and human history. There is no other kind of a chain of events in religious life but one connected by free causes. When a man says that free causes cannot produce infallible results, he speaks simply as a materialist, and is forgetful of the action of spirit upon spirit. Nothing is clearer in Scripture than that the acts of man's will are both entirely free and appointed of God. The acts of Joseph's brethren in selling him into Egypt; the acts of Judas and Pilate in betraying the Lord Jesus, and delivering him to be crucified; the acts of as many as were ordained to eternal life, in Antioch in Pisidia, in the days of Saint Paul, in believing the gospel; and the acts of those in the days of Saint Peter, who stumbled at the word, being disobedient, whereunto also they

were appointed, were all evidently free, and as manifestly appointed of God. So also are all the acts of all men, both free and appointed of God. Every answer to prayer is a case of God's putting his own appointed will into execution by means of free agents. So is every act of providence. So is every fulfilment of prophecy. Indeed the whole staple of the representations of human destinies by human genius, is found in the divine appointment of events on the one hand, and the free human fulfilments of destiny on the other. They all go upon the two wheels of divine destiny and human freedom. Such are believed to be the dramas of the three illustrious Greek tragedians. Such are all the deeper of the dramas of Shakspeare. Such must every true picture of life be, in order to be felt to be true and exhaustive. The tendency of the objection is utterly to subvert the government of God over men. And it is armed with no more forcible weapon than the weak assumption that all divine things must be level to every prejudiced mind.

But it is often affirmed that such exhibitions of the safety of God's chosen people have a tendency to lead them to loose neglect, or to bold presumption. We firmly believe that the proper way to deal with this objection, is a simple denial, and an appeal to the facts. The difference in the effect of cordials on the regenerate, and on the unregenerate mind, is the point involved. Grant that these powerful cordials do highly intoxicate the unregenerate mind, which has been betrayed into a vain and empty profession of faith in Christ. We concede nothing whatever to that consideration, as a reason for withholding the cordials which they need, from the true children of God. That vain and empty profession ought, if possible, to have been avoided. The distinction between the regenerate and the unregenerate condition ought to have been carefully unfolded, and faithfully maintained. There would then have been little need for that *fearful tenet*, the final apostasy of God's true children. God's people are extremely sensitive to danger, easy to be warned, generally in a state of trial, and often terrified by the fiery darts of the adversary. For Christ's sake they are accounted as sheep for the slaughter, and are killed all the day

long. They therefore manifestly need the strong cordial of these great and precious promises, to keep them from sinking into despair, as from time to time, they obtain fresh flashes of the peril of the great pilgrimage. Those cordials, it has pleased God, the Holy Spirit, to decide that they ought to have; and they have them accordingly; as they certainly need them all. These precious assurances belong not to any who do not see in their lives, and their spirits, the evidence that they are children of God. If others apply them to their own intoxication, it is an abuse for which, as far as we can see, the word of God and the true use of it, are in no wise responsible.

A precious vessel floated in air before the entranced eyes of the knights of the Round Table, in the middle ages, which was said to contain the real blood of the Lord Jesus, caught in a hollow jewel, and thus borne through the ages and the climes. But it was another vision which the entranced eyes of the holy apostles saw, to cheer them in their arduous labors, in that adulterous and sinful generation. It was the vision of a precious book, a mighty volume, inscribed thickly with the names of the saints. It was "the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." In it were written the names of persons, souls, ransomed sinners, blood-washed saints; and not merely the names of characters. Saint Paul saw, by inspiration, the names of "Clement and other his fellow-laborers," inscribed therein. Around it clustered thick and ample rays of power and glory to prevent the erasure of any name from its awful pages. To be therein inscribed was the prize for which they strove. And around that book, they saw all the storms of death and life, and angels and principalities and powers, and things present and things to come, and height and depth, and every other creature, rage in vain, to erase a solitary name, even that of the lowliest child of God, from its record.

ARTICLE III.

THE RELATION OF STATE AND CHURCH.

What is the Relation of the State to the Church, is the great unsolved problem of the age.

To many careless thinkers, if thinkers they may be called, this subject may have little or no importance. And to these same persons, the forms of government and other political questions, may appear to be of the utmost importance. Liberty is a theme upon which all are fond of descanting, and upon which those who know the least, can rant the most. A desire for true freedom is the noblest aspiration of the human heart; but in the corruption of human nature, it degenerates into a love of licentiousness, and a state of enmity to the laws of God. Ignorant of what constitutes true freedom, man, in every age, has been struggling for a liberty as imaginary as it is unattainable. Ignorant of the very end to be attained, it is not strange that he should mistake the means, and always fail; ever struggling for a state of freedom and happiness, and ever living in a state of slavery and wretchedness. The few have lived in wealth and power; the many in poverty and slavery. The most despotic governments have been the most permanent: while the most free have been the most short-lived. The former have been numerous, while the latter have been few and far between. The people most free and happy, are those living under republican forms of government. In these the people are said to govern themselves. This is called free government. History shows that free government has been confined to a very small portion of the human family, and to nations the most enlightened, as were the Grecians and Romans among the ancients. Where these ancient republics flourished, where freedom reared her temple, where philosophers and statesmen worshipped at her shrine, where orators eulogised her, and poets sang her praise, despotism has long since waved her sceptre and clanked her

chains. France, maddened by long years of oppression, both civil and ecclesiastical, and, frantic with imaginary ideas of liberty and equality, trampled on the crown and sceptre of royalty, banished the ecclesiastical dignitaries, overturned the altars of God, profaned the temples of religion, deluged the land in blood, and when her delirium had exhausted itself, sank back to her former condition. Her republicanism, purchased at immense cost, was short-lived. The opinion of Napoleon, the greatest hero and statesman of the age, that France was incapable of free government, was fully verified by the result.

The American colonies, after seven years of war, threw off the British yoke, and became free, sovereign, and independent States; united, as such, under the style of the United States, formed, as such, a common government, and adopted a constitution, prepared by the ablest statesmen of the age. This government was formed under the most favorable circumstances. They possessed a large and fertile territory, remote from the influence of surrounding nations, had the history and experience of the past, with all the advantages of Christianity and education, of arts and science. They enjoyed an unparalleled progress in wealth, population, and prosperity. The government of the United States was regarded as the highest achievement of human wisdom, and as the best the world had produced. And yet it had in it the seeds of dissolution. It could not withstand "the irrepressible conflict," emanating from the love of power and plunder in the heart of treason. A century has not passed away since its origin; but the government of our fathers, as it was, is no more. Its name and its shadow remain, but the substance is gone. The States are no longer what they so positively declared themselves to be in the articles of Confederation, and the formation of their respective constitutions, *free, sovereign, and independent States*, possessing all the power, rights, and jurisdiction, not expressly delegated to Congress. Congress no longer acts upon the principle, that it possesses only delegated powers, exercised by the consent of the people of the respective States, who created it, and from whom all its powers were derived.

From all this we conclude:

1. *That sinful man, by his own wisdom, is not capable of establishing and maintaining free or self-government.*

In proof of this, we allege the fact, that, as yet, he never has succeeded. He has tried every form of government, from that of absolute despotism to that of unrestrained democracy. He has blended religion and politics, uniting Church and State, sometimes making the former subordinate and subservient to the latter, and sometimes the latter to the former. At other times, he has endeavored to discard religion from all civil and political matters. And still he has failed to determine what are the elements of freedom and stability in government. The great problem of human freedom and happiness remains unsolved. The relation of the State to the Church is another great problem still unsolved. And strange as it may seem, we think the solution of the one involves that of the other. How important, then, their solution, to every interest of man, both for time and eternity. Our faith is not shaken in the promises of God. We believe the period will come, however remote it may be, when "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord;" "when kings shall be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers of the Church." Then, and not till then, will the freedom and happiness of man become triumphant and universal.

That all men, when they reflect at all, desire such a state, we cannot doubt, without calling in question the character of man as a rational being. But men have sought for freedom and happiness in every direction but the right one. They have looked to the forms of government, but all in vain. A brief analysis of government demonstrates this. The functions of government are three: making, explaining, and executing laws; the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive. It matters not whether these functions are performed by one or many, provided they are wisely and justly done. Good laws, rightly explained, and justly executed, make a good government. Such is the corruption of human nature, that it is deemed unwise to put too much power into the hands of one man. It is thought best to

distribute the functions of government, by investing different persons with the power of exercising its several functions. The executive is not permitted either to make or explain laws. The judiciary cannot make or execute them. The legislative can make laws, but neither interpret nor execute them. By this means, these several powers are supposed to be checks upon one another. An additional check is to render all these functionaries dependent upon the will of the people, and amenable to them. But with all the checks and balances human wisdom can contrive, no government has as yet combined freedom and stability. The English government has approximated more nearly to this than any other. But it is far from the perfect attainment of either one or the other.

Many look to the general intelligence of the people as the great requisite to free and permanent government. This is a very important element. But the general intelligence of no people has ever been sufficient to secure the freedom and stability of government; and we do not hesitate to say, it never will be. History shows that despotism has been established upon the ruins of free government in the golden age of intellectual development. The liberties of Greece perished while the eloquence of Demosthenes, that prince of orators, was still ringing in her ears. The liberty of Rome went down, while the eloquence of Cicero, her world-renowned orator, and the strains of her most famous bards were lingering around the temple of freedom. The hopes of the republic of France were extinguished, not by intellectual, but by moral darkness. Not intellectual, but moral darkness and corruption have destroyed the freedom of the people in every age.

We are forced to the conclusion that no amount of advancement in mere intelligence, will secure the freedom and happiness of a people, or the stability of government. The monsters of the French revolution were not wanting in intellectual development. They were, however, wanting in all the moral elements essential to good government. Hence there has been a conviction in the minds of men in every age, that there exists an inseparable connexion between religion and government.

RELIGION AND GOVERNMENT.

In every age and nation, religion and government have been intimately associated. By the great majority of mankind, the culture of religion has been deemed essential to the existence of government. This has been especially so among the most enlightened nations, which have made the greatest progress in government and civilisation. "We" says Cicero, "have surpassed all tribes and nations in piety as in religion, and in this one wisdom, that we have perceived all things to be ruled and governed by the divinity of the immortal gods." Ranke, speaking of the multitude of tribes settled around the Mediterranean and its coasts, and as far inland as known, observes, "The independence they enjoyed was not merely political: in every country a local religion arose; the ideas of God and of divine things became, as it were, appropriated to certain places; national deities of the most diversified attributes occupied the world; and the law obeyed by their votaries became inseparably identified with that of the State. We may venture to assert that this intimate union of religion and state, this two-fold freedom, which was shackled only by the light obligations imposed by community of blood, had the largest share in fashioning the character of antiquity." *Ranke's Hist. Popes*, chap. i. Up to the time of our Saviour, religion and government, in every nation, were intimately associated. All regarded the sanctions of religion as essential to the existence of government; even the sceptical philosophers deemed it necessary for the common people.

Our Saviour first proclaimed, "My kingdom is not of this world;" and upon this declaration, set up his kingdom. Only a few centuries passed away, until Christianity extended her conquests over the throne of the Cæsars. The Church became powerful, wealthy, proud, and corrupt, seized upon the temporal power, and became a kingdom of this world; exercising both civil and ecclesiastical authority, and establishing a politico-religious tyranny unparalleled in the world's history.

The next phase in the world's history is the great struggle in opposition to this ecclesiastical despotism. This was the struggle

of centuries, of the political against the ecclesiastical, and of Protestantism against Roman Catholicism. Popes crowned or deposed kings at their pleasure. Sometimes kings put down one pope to set up another. These conflicts have passed away. Ecclesiastical supremacy is no longer recognised. But the declaration of our Saviour, "My kingdom is not of this world," is neither practically understood nor acted upon. Church and State remain allied together in most governments.

If we ask, Can government exist independent of religion? the history and experience of the world will answer, No. If we ask, Shall the State support religion, and shall there be a union between Church and State? a large majority of the world will reply in the affirmative; and the ablest writers and statesmen will advocate such a union. It is only a few years since the great struggle occurred in Scotland, between the advocates of a Church establishment and the friends of a free Church. In May, 1843, Dr. Chalmers, with four hundred and seventy clergymen, and their adherents, *seceded* from the Church Establishment, and founded the Free Church. Near about the same time, Mr. Gladstone, not satisfied with "Paley's Defence of the Church," published a book, the object of which was to show, "that the propagation of religious truth is one of the principal ends of government as government. He would not fine, imprison, or torture heretics, but he would exclude them from all political offices, and subject them to various disabilities. The historian, philosopher, and statesman Macaulay, has refuted his positions in a masterly manner. Yet he is careful to have it understood that he is no opponent of the Church Establishment, and takes the ground, that the propagation of religious truth is not the *primary*, but the *secondary* object of government. When the question is asked, What religion shall be established? he gives in to the answer of Bishop Warburton, viz., that of the majority.

Vattel, a standard author on the Law of Nations, regards the influence of piety and religion upon a nation as so important as to require a separate chapter. The excellent remarks of this writer deserve the consideration of all legislators and statesmen.

He remarks, "Enlightened piety in a people is the firmest support of lawful authority; and, in the sovereign's heart, it is the pledge of the people's safety, and excites their confidence. Ye lords of the earth, who acknowledge no superior here below, what security can we have for the purity of your intentions, if we do not conceive you to be deeply impressed with respect for the common Father and Lord of men, and animated with a desire to please him."

"We have already insinuated that piety ought to be attended with knowledge. In vain would we propose to please God, if we knew not the means of doing it. But what a deluge of evils arise, when men, heated by so powerful a motive, are prompted to take methods that are equally false and pernicious. A blind piety only produces superstitious bigots, fanatics, and persecutors, a thousand times more dangerous and destructive to society than libertines are. There have appeared barbarous tyrants who have talked of nothing but the glory of God, while they crushed the people, and trampled under foot the most sacred laws of nature." Again he says, "Religion consists in the doctrines concerning the Deity, and the things of another life, and in the worship appointed to the honor of the Supreme Being. So far as it is seated in the *heart, it is an affair of conscience;* but so far as it is *external and publicly established, it is an affair of State.*" "The establishment of religion by law, and its public exercise, are matters of State, and are necessarily under the jurisdiction of political authority. If all men are bound to serve God, the entire nation, in her national capacity, is doubtless obliged to serve and honor him."

It will be seen that there are several respects in which we object to the views of Vattel. At present, we shall not stop to criticise them. To the question, What religion shall be established? he replies as Bishop Warburton and Macaulay: "That which shall have the approbation of the majority, shall be received and publicly established by law; by which means it shall become the religion of the State." He then discusses the difficulties which may arise from the opposition of the minority.

In the United States, the Gordian knot is cut by ignoring the subject of religion as much as possible. In our political institutions, the Bible, Talmud, and Korán are equally ignored; except that the Bible is used in administering oaths. Christianity receives no particular recognition, the Decalogue is unnoticed, Christ, the Mediator, is not named, nor even Jehovah acknowledged as the supreme Ruler of the universe. Our constitutions are negatively infidel and atheistic. From one extreme, that of bigotry and persecution, our statesmen have rushed into the other, that of infidelity and atheism. The pernicious and dangerous effects of this negative infidelity, are seen in the licentiousness and fanaticism so prevalent in the United States. An open warfare has long been waged upon religion and morality; in attempts to do away with the Sabbath; to expel the Bible from public schools; to exclude religious men and religious influence from literary institutions; in the establishment of infidel clubs and Tom Paine celebrations; in Sabbath drinking and gambling saloons and theatricals; in the propagation of false and licentious ideas in regard to human liberty; ignoring the divine government and under the name of the "higher law," deifying the blind instincts of depraved humanity. To what else could all this lead, but to the manifestation of human depravity in a variety of pernicious *isms?*

Mormonism comes forth with no other credentials than the lying legends of stupid and wicked impostors; and with no allurements save the gratification of the vilest lusts. And yet, in this nineteenth century, and in this land of Bibles, churches, and Sabbath-schools; without the sword wielded by the prophet of Mecca, she enlists her thousands, lays hold of a large territory, tramples on the Constitution and laws of the United States, discards the civilisation of the age, defies the government, and rears up a new Sodom. All this has been done in the name of religion, and no preference could be given by the Constitution to one religion over another. Congress had no moral standard by which to determine the merits of Mormonism. If she robbed the Gentiles of property, she claimed divine authority for it. If she established the most degrading and pernicious form of polygamy,

it was in the exercise of religion. What could a government do that discarded all interference with religion? The Bible sanctions domestic servitude in the history of the patriarchs, in the decalogue, in the civil institutions of the Israelites, and in the precepts and instructions in the gospel; but there was a "*higher law*" than the Bible to set aside its teachings. Utah was poor. She had no aristocracy to excite envy and hatred, no wealth to reward the toils and dangers of the plunderer, and no laurels to be won by military chieftains.

We have made this exposition of our own government and people, because it is regarded, and probably is, the best that human wisdom can devise without the aid of Revelation. It may, therefore, be considered as demonstrated, that, on the one hand, self-government, or freedom, and the union of State and Church, are incompatible, and that, on the other hand, a government which ignores the Bible, cannot bestow freedom on the people, and at the same time possess stability. History further proves that a union of Church and State, as in England, constitutes a better and more permanent government than one which is negatively infidel.

THE HARMONY OF HUMAN AND DIVINE GOVERNMENT.

The Creator of the universe has established his government over all the works of his hands. The physical world has its laws, all founded upon certain relations, and adapted to its subjects. Chemistry discusses the laws which govern atoms in changes ever going on in the compositions and decompositions of physical bodies; Astronomy, the laws of the solar system; Vegetable Physiology, the laws of vegetable life; and Animal Physiology, those of animal life. The violation of these laws is invariably attended with destruction. The existence of society and government is founded upon the moral law. The violation of moral law is destructive to society and government to the extent of its violation. *Government is not founded upon religion.* The almost universal belief that religion is essential to the existence of government, is the result of con-

founding morality and religion. This, too, is the cause of many errors in the theological world. Here, too, is the source of all the difficulties which have arisen as to the relation between State and Church; the conflicts between civil and ecclesiastical power, the union of Church and State, alike injurious to both; the bigotry, intolerance, and persecution, and bloodshed. Out of this confusion of morality and religion, grow many errors and many perplexing questions, relating to the liberty of conscience, of speech, and of free discussion; also, in regard to the extent to which obedience is due to civil law. The analogy of nature, the history of the human race, and the teachings of the Bible, all go to prove that the freedom and happiness of any people, and the stability of government, depend upon its being in harmony with the divine government. The moral law is the constitution, the fundamental and cardinal principle of this divine government. This moral law is immutable for two reasons: first, because it is a transcript of the divine perfections, revealing the character of its author; and, secondly, because it is founded upon fixed and unalterable relations, viz., those of the Creator to his creatures, and of the creatures to one another. The necessity for it arises out of the sinful condition and the social relations of man, and is therefore the same as the necessity for all human government. The design of the moral law is two-fold. First, as a rule of action, like the tree of knowledge, of good and evil, teaching man the difference between right and wrong, and guiding him, in proportion as he observes it, to freedom and happiness, or dooming him to the opposite, in proportion to his neglect of it. In the second place, it reveals to him his true condition as guilty and condemned—a hopeless sinner in the sight of God—his utter inability to keep a perfectly holy law, and his need of deliverance from sin and misery from a divine source. It is the mirror which reveals his moral deformity, and the desperate malady of his disease, sin; and the necessity of a divine Mediator and Redeemer. Hence the apostle (Gal. iii. 24, 25,) speaks of the office of the law as that of "a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith."

As the necessity for the moral law and human government is the same, so is their design the same.

ALL GOVERNMENT IS AN ORDINANCE OF GOD.

We have shown that the moral law and human government have the same origin and the same design; the one as well as the other is an ordinance of God. Paul says, (Rom. xiii. 1–7,) "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall secure to themselves damnation, (*i. e.* judgment or condemnation.) For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

The whole context shows government, here called an ordinance of God, to be in harmony with the moral law. We cannot, for a moment, suppose that God, having by a divine constitution of things, made man the subject of an immutable law, as we have shown the moral law to be, should ordain any government violating it. All governments, to a greater or less extent, teach and enforce the moral law: otherwise they would be destructive to society, and could not exist. Just in so far as they teach and enforce the moral law, they are ordinances of God. All authority to exercise government is derived from God, under the moral law. Every moral being is created under that law, bound by his constitution, by duty and by interest, to teach and enforce it. It is, therefore, the duty and interest of man to establish

government for this end. God has ordained that he should. But man has no authority, and no right to violate the moral law, either in the manner of establishing or exercising government. Nor is it the duty of any man to obey human, when opposed to divine authority. For we are bound to obey God rather than man. As it is the duty of every man, as a moral and accountable being, to teach and enforce the moral law to the extent of his influence, so it is the duty of every man to maintain the moral law, both in the establishment and exercise of government. He owes this to God, to himself, and to his fellow-creatures.

It is the mission of the State to teach and enforce the moral law:

1. Because it is the charter of all the rights which God has given to man. No right can be withheld, and no wrong inflicted without some violation of the moral law. A strict observance of the moral law, would secure all the rights, all the freedom and happiness to which man is entitled, and of which he is capable; no matter what may be the form of government. Hence God has ordained no particular form of government; but has left it to the wisdom of man to establish such forms as seem best adapted to the condition of the people, and the ends of government itself. A correct exposition of the moral law would be the best system of moral philosophy that could be given to the world. Moral science would present a systematic view of moral precepts with their proper application and illustration. Moral philosophy would discuss the relations upon which the law is founded, presenting the reasons of its existence. There is more or less error in every system of moral philosophy which men have attempted to establish, taking simply the light of nature or reason for their guide. These errors become interwoven with political systems, and result, sometimes in the overthrow, and always in the injury of government. If, instead of the false teachings contained in the moral philosophies, so called, and taught in schools and colleges, and incorporated in the Declaration of Independence, and propagated from the rostrum and the pulpit, and by the press, both political and religious, "as self-

evident truths," to which the authority of the Bible itself must yield, the Decalogue or moral law, as explained and illustrated in the Old and New Testaments, had been incorporated in our Constitution and declared to be the basis of government, and the supreme law of the land, abolitionism, and the Protean forms of radicalism and fanaticism would never have gained the ascendancy, deluged the country in blood, and disgraced the name of Christianity and civilisation by a war which has subverted the liberties of the people, by the establishment of a central and party despotism.

In a government recognising the supreme authority of the moral law, demanding no rights which it does not sanction, and idolizing no deity of licentiousness under the name of liberty, the subjects of freedom and slavery could have produced no political agitation, much less a war of desolation, ending, as all the omens at present would seem to show, in a central despotism.

2. Because, in every government, there must be a supreme authority some where, an ultimate tribunal. It must be an authority which cannot be called in question. No human authority will be recognised as such. Morality, we have said, is the basis of all government. The Decalogue, contained in the Bible, and illustrated in the Old and New Testaments, is the only perfect moral code known to man. It claims the homage, and receives the sanction of all men, whether Jew or Gentile, whether learned or unlearned. The man who objects to it, must be pronounced morally insane; and, therefore, unfit to have any share in the affairs of government.

3. Because the moral law is the only basis of free government. It claims to come from the Supreme Ruler of the universe, and brings with it the most satisfactory credentials. It places all men upon a level as subjects of the divine government, defines their rights, not according to some imaginary equality which never has existed and never will exist, but according to their several stations and relations; and demands the execution of judgment and justice, in truth and righteousness, clothing its demands with all the sanctions of a holy, omniscient, and omni-

potent Judge, from whom there is no escape, either in time or eternity. It does not propose to alter the constitution, or reverse the present order of things; to declare that man, born under the law, and subject to law according to the circumstances of his birth, is free, and can be governed only by his own consent; that the king and the beggar, the philosopher and the fool, the servant and his master, are either intellectually, politically, or socially equal. Such absurdities and falsehoods were left to be divulged by insane fanatics, whose doctrines are alike incompatible with both human and divine government.

4. Because the ends of government will never be fully attained until human government is in harmony with the divine; and this will never be, until the State fulfils her mission by teaching and enforcing the moral law. Then will the freedom and happiness of man and the stability of government be secured. Then will the grand design of all human governments be accomplished, when they shall become teachers, propagators, and supporters of the moral law, revealing the sin and condemnation of the world; and leaving the sinner, slain by the law, to search for a remedy in the gospel of Christ. For the law is a school-master to bring us to Christ, that we may be justified by faith. It is thus that all human governments will become subordinate to the divine, and made to contribute to the extension of Christ's mediatorial kingdom. It is only thus that kings can become nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers to the Church.

For be it known, that the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, with the new creation in Christ Jesus, is the greatest and highest manifestation of God's glory; that creation, the whole of the present constitution of things, the nations, the kingdoms and empires, arts and sciences, manners and customs, the laws and governments, are subordinate to the mediatorial kingdom of Christ; and this, with all that is subordinate to it, to the manifestation of God's perfections and glory; and that all things will be so overruled as to accomplish the end of their existence.

THE RELATION OF THE STATE TO THE CHURCH IS THE SAME AS THAT OF THE LAW TO THE GOSPEL.

The necessity for the law grows out of the moral condition and social relations of man, and its design is two-fold: First, to secure the peace, freedom, and happiness of nations; and secondly, to prepare man for the reception of the gospel, and for that real, most exalted, and only permanent peace, freedom, and happiness which are to be found only in the kingdom of Christ. All the aspirations of man for freedom and happiness are designed to lead him to the kingdom of Christ, where alone they can in reality be found. All that the law can bestow, is only the shadow of that which the gospel can alone bestow. The world does not yet appear to understand the declaration of the gospel, "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John viii. 36.

Lieber, in his work on "Civil Liberty," after filling several pages with the various attempts of learned authors to define the terms, *liberty* and *civil liberty*, has himself attempted a definition, and made a most signal failure. When the learned have such vague ideas of *liberty*, it is not strange that the great mass of mankind should idolize an imaginary deity, under the name of Liberty, and become intoxicated with visionary blessings of freedom. Fanaticism is fruitful in such idols and visions of imaginary things. It is at best a species of mental derangement, shrewd and logical enough in reasoning from false premises, eloquent in words and dazzling enough in tropes and figures to wield an influence over the unthinking populace. What else have been all the rhapsodies on the subjects of *liberty*, *fraternity*, and *equality*, in France and this country, but the insane effusions of fanaticism? And in what have they resulted, but in aggression upon the rights of others, resulting in war, bloodshed, and the establishment of despotism? Every struggle for liberty without knowing what it is, must result only in evil. The truth confronts us in the history of every nation, that people have put themselves into the hands of tyrants, and enslaved themselves in battling for a freedom imaginary and unattainable. Fanaticism,

in every age the scourge of the world, only knows how to destroy, not how to build up.

The first step toward the attainment of liberty, is to know in what it consists. The word suggests a simple idea, viz., to do as one pleases, to act as *I will.* It is therefore the harmony of a man's actions with his will. And it is neither more nor less. The angels are perfectly free, and yet they are subject to a holy law which they perfectly obey. They do precisely as they will; their chief delight being to do the will of God. This is a freedom unattainable by man: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. viii. 7. The will in perfect harmony with the law, is perfect freedom. The design of the gospel is to remove the enmity of the carnal mind, and to bring it into harmony with the law of God; to deliver it from the dominion of sin, and restore it to the freedom of holiness. This is the freedom spoken of in John viii. 36. It is the freedom enjoyed by angels, and will be that of the redeemed.

Liberty, we have said, consists in doing as we please. What are the limitations to this? In relation to the law of God, no man is permitted to violate it without incurring its penalties. Nor is a man permitted to violate the laws of the land. The existence and good of society will not allow it. So far as a man approves of the laws, and it is his pleasure to obey them, so far is he free. All political freedom is at most only partial. All conflict between a man's actions and his will, is so much restraint upon his liberty; so is violence done to his will; as when he is forced by any threatened pains or penalties to take an oath of which he does not approve. One of the greatest outrages upon liberty is found in compulsory oaths. What the moral law permits, and what it prohibits, is the extent and the limit of human authority. All human legislation forbidding what the moral law permits, or requiring what it forbids, is a usurpation of man's rights, and a violation of his liberty. It is a violation of conscience, if it prohibits the performance of duties required by the moral law.

The liberty of speech and of the press ought to be determined

by the same standard. The whole subject of slavery was one to be determined, not by false political axioms, the offspring of infidelity, or by the "*higher law*," the instinct of corrupt humanity, but by moral law as taught and illustrated in the Old and New Testaments. The fact that the moral law is in part founded upon the relation of master and servant, in the sense of slave, as the whole history of domestic servitude among the Israelites, and the relative duties enjoined most fully in the New Testament demonstrate, proves that domestic servitude is a form of government ordained of God. From this it follows that all interference with this institution was a usurpation and a violation of the moral law. A war for the purpose of abolishing it, was an aggressive and wicked war. All these evils have resulted from the establishment of government upon principles at war with the divine government.

Observing this great defect in the government of the United States, and the consequences resulting from it, the late and much lamented Dr. Thornwell introduced a memorial into the Southern General Assembly in 1861, with a view to an amendment to the Constitution of the Confederate States, recognising Christ, the Mediator, as King of kings, and as the supreme Ruler of the nations. It was withdrawn by its mover on the appearance of opposition. It could not, and ought not to have been adopted. It embraced an article of the creed enjoined in the gospel. The moral law, and not the gospel, is the basis of civil government. While the law and gospel are intimately related, they are entirely distinct. What this relation is, has been shown.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE LAW AND GOSPEL.

The law consists of precepts to control the actions of men. It has no control over any thing which cannot be defined and proven. Whatever control it has over motives and feelings, is only in so far as these are open and manifested by outward acts or expressions. Thus, killing with malice aforethought is murder. This malice, however, must be manifested by some act or expression, rendering it susceptible of proof. The gospel, on

the contrary, consists of a creed, of a faith controlling the feelings and affections. So far as the law attempts to control these, its operation is indirect, through the control of the external actions. The gospel aims at the outward acts, through faith controlling the affections. It would purify the fountain, so that the waters shall of necessity be sweet. The law is founded upon man's present relations, looks to the existence and welfare of society, to the life, property, and rights of man as a member of the community; and has respect only to the things that are temporal. The gospel aims at the establishment of a spiritual kingdom, composed of members born of the Spirit, created anew through faith in Christ Jesus, and sanctified by a belief of the truth; created anew, not by, but unto, good works. It aims at the restoration of fallen man to the image of God; at bringing his perverted will and corrupt affections from a state of enmity to the law of God into harmony with it; at the deliverance of man from the bondage of sin, and his restoration to the liberty of the gospel. Whilst it is true that "godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come," (1 Tim. iv. 8,) the gospel relates not so much to the things which are temporal as to those which are spiritual. Our Saviour said, "My kingdom is not of this world." The context shows the meaning of this declaration. This kingdom does not consist of civil or political power, as do the kingdoms of this world. He claimed no right to wield the sword of the warrior, even in self-defence. His kingdom is in this world—its members, its officers, its instrumentalities, and its operations. But as members of his kingdom, they exercise no functions, civil, political, or military. Its members are spiritual. It is aggressive, and aims at the conquest of the world; but the weapons of its warfare are not carnal, but spiritual.

The Church is the visible organisation and representative of this kingdom. Its mission is to proclaim the gospel of Christ, to convince men of sin, and persuade them to be reconciled to God through Christ. Its officers are ambassadors for Christ, who in his stead are to beseech men to be reconciled to God.

The very idea of religion precludes all idea of force. It is the harmony of the human with the divine will. It is a voluntary condition of the moral feelings. The only force or power at all applicable in religion, is moral and spiritual. Hence, all attempts to propagate religion by the sword, by instruments of torture, by dungeons, disabilities, or persecution of any kind, are as absurd as they are wicked. They are the weapons of a carnal warfare, the instrumentalities of Satan. Matters of creed, of faith, feeling, and affection, whether religious, moral, or political, cannot be controlled by acts of violence and oppression.

Whatever relation Church members may sustain as citizens of the State, whatever offices they may hold, whatever duties may devolve upon them as such; the Church, as a Church, must not interfere or meddle with civil or political matters; except it be in defence of her rights and privileges as a Church of Christ. The political resolutions and proceedings of the Presbyterian General Assembly of the North, at its meeting held at Pittsburg, 1865, show a sad state of apostasy from the kingdom of Christ, which "is not of this world." It virtually converted itself into a political body, proclaiming political creeds, and adopting political measures to enforce them, exhibiting the same intolerance, stupidity, and wickedness manifested by the fanatical party now dominant.

On the other hand, the State has no right to interfere with the Church, to dictate, in regard to its creed, the organisation of its ecclesiastical bodies, the form or matter of its prayers, sermons, or ordinances; to shut or open churches, or to say who shall or shall not preach. All such acts are gross usurpations of power, which belongs to Christ as the Head of the Church, to be administered through the proper officers of the Church. Such usurpations are treason against both God and man. They were common in the dark ages. Who, five years ago, would have supposed that such outrages upon religious liberty would ever be committed in the United States?

In Missouri, a provost marshal presided over the organisation of a Presbytery, admitting or rejecting members upon political

principles. In the same State, a most infamous oath has been required of ministers of the gospel, or they are prohibited from preaching. A letter written from St. Louis to a friend in Aberdeen, Miss., says, "Our State prison is filled with preachers, and the noblest men of the land. A glorious record to go down to posterity!" Gen. Wood, under the direction of Major-General George H. Thomas, issued an order suspending the bishop and clergy of the diocese of Alabama, and closing all the Protestant Episcopal churches in the State; simply because the bishop, on the 20th of June, directed the clergy not to read the prayer for the President and others in civil authority, until the blessings of civil government should be restored to the State. All the Episcopal churches were taken possession of by the soldiers of General Thomas. To destroy or take possession of churches has been a common thing, wherever fanaticism reigned. These are specimens of the high-handed tyranny, of the intolerance, and religious persecution which have been quite common in this land of boasted liberty. We used to turn to Europe and to the dark ages for examples of political and religious intolerance and persecution; but we can now find abundant examples in our own age and country. It is the duty of the Church, in the name of the great Head of the Church, to protest most solemnly against all such usurpations. What right has a military officer to say whether men shall pray or not, or to say when or how they shall pray? What right has he to suspend ministers of the gospel, close churches, and deprive the people of their religious rights? Men cannot pray as others may choose to dictate. Prayer is the offering up of the desires of the heart to God for things agreeable to his will. If the utterances of the heart are not in the words, it is only profane mockery. To ask knowingly for things contrary to the will of God, is wicked presumption. We cannot pray for the prosperity of the wicked, or the success and triumph of tyrants. During the great revolution through which we have just passed, many have been greatly perplexed as to their duty in prayer. Our Saviour thus teaches us, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you,

and persecute you." The context shows that our Saviour is inculcating that spirit of universal benevolence which must characterise every holy being. He assigns the reason, viz., "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and unjust." Some have supposed these teachings to be at variance with many passages in the prayers of the Psalmist. Such a conclusion is the result neither of profound reflection nor of deep piety. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is all consistent, one portion with every other portion, when rightly understood. Those very passages which appear inconsistent, are the best interpreters of each other. But their proper interpretation requires that, by generalizing, we arrive at the great principles which serve to guide us in our exposition. For the prayers of the Psalmist against his enemies, see Ps. lviii., lix., lxix., lxxi., lxxxiii. Others might be referred to, but these will suffice. In all the passages which may be selected from the psalms, there is nothing more terrible to the wicked than 1 Cor. xvi. 22, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema-Maranatha." The first petition in that model prayer given us by the Lord Jesus is, "Thy kingdom come." This teaches us to pray for the success of all agencies, instrumentalities, and means employed in advancing the kingdom of Christ. It necessarily implies a desire and prayer for the defeat and overthrow of all impediments to the coming of his kingdom. The second petition is, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." The same heavenly Father, "who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and unjust," executeth justice and judgment among the nations. How terrible the judgments of God are, is shown both in revelation and providence. However severe they may be, they are displays of his justice; to which with profound reverence we must say, Amen, "thy will be done." While it is enjoined upon us in the exercise of universal benevolence, to love our enemies, there are certainly many limitations to the precept. We cannot and are not required to love devils. Nor are we required to love sinners

as such. We should love the souls of men, and desire their salvation. God so loved the world in its sinful and lost condition as to send his beloved Son to die, the just for the unjust. Christ first loved us and gave himself for us. So ought Christians to wish and pray for the salvation of sinners, and the well-being of all men; and to pray for all in authority, that they may be led to love mercy and do justice. At the same time, it is right and proper to pray that the wicked, and especially wicked rulers, may be arrested in their career, that tyrants and oppressors may be punished; and that truth, justice, and righteousness may triumph. It is moreover the duty of all Christians to be consistent, to make their actions and all their influence conform to their prayers. It is a mockery to pray that God would give us wise and good rulers, and then assist in putting bad men into office. The overthrow of all governments has been the result of putting bad men in power. History will show that the people of every nation are as free as they are fit to be. That fitness must consist in the moral elevation of the people. There must be such a standard controlling public opinion, that unprincipled demagogues will have no influence; that none but men of high moral character, men of known integrity, will control the affairs of government. There must be a great reformation, both in State and Church. The distinctive sphere of each must be defined. They must be kept entirely distinct. And yet, in discharge of their respective duties, there must be perfect harmony. In fulfilling their respective missions, they must aim at the same great end, the purity, the peace, the freedom, and happiness of the people.

THE MORAL LAW.

We have said that not *religion*, but *morality* is the basis of civil government. We have all along referred to the decalogue, contained in the Bible, as the only perfect summary of moral law. Law always implies a law-giver. Perfection in the law, implies perfection in the law-giver. This implies, at least, three things—perfection in knowledge, justice, and power; knowledge in framing the law, comprehending its full extent and impor-

tance; justice in assigning proper rewards and punishments; and power to execute it with the utmost certainty. A perfect moral law can only emanate from God. The decalogue is complete, as a moral law, in all essentials. It consists of two parts, logically connected. The first part brings before us the Law-giver, with the relations which we sustain to him as the Creator and one Law-giver; and demands our supreme homage. It guards us against substituting any thing for him, or forming any false ideas of him. It claims profound reverence for his name and attributes, and forbids all disrespect or want of reverence. It claims a portion of our time for the contemplation of our relation to him, and the study of our duties. All this forms not only an important but essential part of a moral system. We cannot admire the wisdom of those who would exclude the fourth commandment from the moral law. To acquire a knowledge of the law, is necessary to obedience, and therefore, to study the law is a part of the obedience due to it.

The second part of the law presents us with a summary of the duties which we owe to our fellow men; being founded upon the relations which we sustain to them. These two parts, the first consisting of four, and the second of six commandments,—the first founded upon our relation to the Law-giver, and the second part, on the relations which we sustain to one another,—make one complete whole. Every commandment in the decalogue is a logical and essential part of a perfect moral law.

We wish this to be distinctly understood. We wish to expose that great error so prevalent among men, in excluding the first part of the decalogue from the moral law, and placing it under the head of religion. No man should be regarded as a moral man who violates any one of the ten commandments. It is very common among men to speak of a man as a moral man who pays no regard to the first part of the moral law, and to regard him as a religious man, if he respects the Sabbath, and is free from profaneness. The observance of the moral law is *morality*, and not *religion*. Angels live in obedience to the law. They are perfect *moral* beings, but not *religious* beings. Man, before the fall, was a moral being, and had he kept the law, he would

have been justified and lived by the *law*, not by FAITH. The term religion, from "*religo*," to bind back, is strictly applicable only to the condition of fallen man, brought back to a state of allegiance to God through the mediatorial work of Christ. The law and morality go together; the gospel and religion. The law is for the State, and the gospel for the Church. The State cannot exist without the law; nor the Church without the gospel. The law prepares men for the gospel; the State should indirectly prepare them for the Church.

We have shown in what the law consists, and we have shown that it is the mission of the State to teach and enforce the law. Obedience to the law is to be considered in two respects: obedience in acts, outward and external; and inward or spiritual obedience, the homage of the heart. The former is all that the State can enforce. Its authority extends no farther. This secures the ends of government, protects the lives, the persons, and property of men, and secures the peace and good order of society. Love, says our Saviour, is the fulfilling of the law. But the affections are beyond human power. Over these the State can have no authority. It is the mission of the gospel to change the heart, and control the affections, to lead men to love God and obey the law because they love him and delight in his law. Here is the co-operation of the law and gospel, the one by restraint—by external force; the other by an inward influence, enforcing obedience to the law; both conducing to the same end. It is the mission of the State to teach and enforce it outwardly, and of the Church to teach and enforce it inwardly; the one formally, the other spiritually; the one operating through fear, the other through love. Man, under the one, is a slave; under the other, he is free. He is no longer "under the law, but under grace." Rom. vi. 14. We have defined freedom to be the harmony of a man's will with his actions, and that these must be in harmony with the law, and that all laws and government should be in harmony with the divine law and government.

We remark next:

That the condition of fitness must precede a state of freedom,

and must be continued in order to perpetuate freedom. Neither forms of government nor acts of legislation can make a people free who are not fit to be so. The bear or the tiger may be uncaged and unchained, but this will not alter the nature of either. The idea of legislating, governing, coercing, or forcing men into freedom, is one of the political quackeries of an insane fanaticism. In France, during the "reign of terror," they equalized men by the guillotine. It was left for the immortal sages of the radical party to discover the freedom of coercion, *involuntary freedom*, established by swords and bayonets, by oaths and dungeons.

The only fitness which can establish and perpetuate free government is *moral fitness.* Morality is its only basis. The decalogue is the only perfect and authoritative code of morals. It justly demands the homage of all men. It has a sphere entirely distinct from religion. It interferes with the creed of no religious denomination. At the same time, it is a rule of action for men of every creed, and excludes from the temple of God the devotees of licentiousness and superstition. It is a test of creeds, enabling us to know their truth or falsehood. By their fruits ye shall know them. The State cannot recognise any thing as religion which violates the moral law. The government had no right to punish the Mormon for his creed, but it had a right to punish his immoral acts.

How shall the liberty of the people of these United States be restored and perpetuated?

We answer, by a reformation both in State and Church. The State must fulfil its mission, teach and enforce the moral law, in all its parts. The Church must fulfil its mission. The one must secure formal, and the other spiritual, obedience to the law. Moral fitness must be required of every one in office. "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn." Prov. xxix. 2. The first step is to remove from power all immoral men. The next is to make the State an example, as well as a teacher, and supporter of morality. So long as the government, as such, is an open violator of the moral law, it is a demoraliser of the

people. All who, by their votes and influence, countenance and support an immoral government, are participators in its guilt. Whenever we urge obedience to the moral law, especially to the first part of it, we shall no doubt hear the old cry raised of "a union of Church and State." We have drawn the line of distinction between morality and religion, and between State and Church so clearly, and defined their separate spheres of action so plainly, that, we think, such a cry will only serve to expose the hypocrisy and wickedness of those who make it. Let the Church stand aloof from all party political associations, and combine all her efforts to bring all laws and government into harmony with the divine government. It is the duty of every Christian not only to pray, "Thy kingdom come," but to use all his influence to make all the kingdoms of this world subordinate to the kingdom of Christ. When we speak of the Church, it is in no sectarian sense. We include Christians of every denomination. Sectarianism has impressed the image of the world upon the Church. The State has had its party demagogues, and the Church its sectarian wranglers; the one as pernicious to the State, as the other is to the Church, and both governed by like motives. The stars are separate and distinct bodies, each occupying its own position, and moving in its own sphere; yet all pour forth their mellow light, and the mingling and blending of their rays constitute the beauty and glory of the night. The rays of color are all diverse, yet, when blended together, they form the light. The law and the gospel, State and Church, are all distinct; so are the different denominations of the Church; yet the great mission of all is the same, to establish "peace upon earth, and good will toward men;" to redeem man from sin, slavery, and suffering, and secure for him purity, freedom, and happiness. To this great end, let the law and the gospel, the State and the Church, send forth all their separate and distinct influences, yet all harmoniously uniting and blending in the accomplishment of the same great end, the establishment of the millenium upon earth—the reign of peace and righteousness. Away with ambitious, unprincipled demagogues, party politicians, word-jugglers, political quacks, and

sorcerers, who corrupt and deceive the people, while killing them to keep them alive, enslaving them to make them free, desolating them to enrich them, torturing them to make them happy, and instead of uniting them by love, bind them together with iron fetters.

Away with sectarian wranglers who worship the images of rites, forms, and ceremonies, saying "Lo! here is Christ"; while the cross, revealing the love of God and Christ, is eclipsed by the drapery of religion; and that charity or love without which all professions and all externals in the name of religion are nothing, is forgotten, and, in its stead, envy, jealousy, and strife engendered. Let the State, reformed, be guided only by the law from Sinai, and the Church know nothing save the gospel from Calvary.

CONCLUSION.

We have now shown the utter failure of man in all attempts to establish and perpetuate free or self-government.

We have exposed the great error of the world in confounding morality and religion, and making the latter the basis of government, leading to a union of Church and State, to the destruction of both civil and religious liberty.

We have exposed the opposite error of excluding morality with a view to separate Church and State, and its disastrous results to freedom.

We have observed that nations are just as free as the great majority are capable of being; that fitness for freedom must precede its establishment; that forms of government and acts of legislation cannot make a people free.

We have maintained that the only fitness for freedom is not intellectual, but moral.

We have maintained that human governments must be in harmony with the divine; that the moral law is the basis of all good government, and that the relation of the State to the Church is the same as that of the moral law to the gospel; that it is the mission of the State to teach and enforce the moral law; while it is the mission of the Church to teach and inculcate the

gospel; that while they are entirely distinct, their harmonious action conduces to the same great end; that we must look to their united influence for the establishment of freedom and happiness; that there must be a reformation in both State and Church; and that to this end all Christians, good men and patriots, should pray and exert all their influence.

ARTICLE IV.

LIFE AND TIMES OF BERTRAND DU GUESCLIN:

A HISTORY OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

By D. F. JAMISON, *of South Carolina. In two volumes. Charleston:* JOHN RUSSELL: MDCCCLXIV.

This beautifully printed and classical book is truly a cenotaph, alike of the lamented author and of the shortlived but noble country, in whose service, and for whose sake, he died. So long and closely associated was General Jamison in the minds of all his friends with the toils and hopes which culminated here, that one cannot name the work without calling into vivid remembrance that thoughtful, earnest face, whose habitually melancholy expression was as habitually penetrated by kindness, friendship, and domestic affections; that slender frame, somewhat bowed by feeble health for many years, and of late stooping under the burden of public responsibilities—a burden which could scarcely be borne, but which could not be shunned; that voice, pleasant when heard, but so subdued and unsonorous as to perpetuate the impression made by the reticence and abstraction whose place it took.

For a man so recluse in his temper, and even in his habits, Gen. Jamison's public influence was singularly large and permanent: to be accounted for only by the fact that his careful mind, and his comprehensive study of history and politics, had made

him the "guide, philosopher, and friend" of men more aggressive, more externally energetic than himself. Through them—until the few signal closing scenes—through them, rather than by his own voice or personal action, did his patriotism and sagacity make themselves felt. Then, indeed, in those last tragic years, the justness of his mind, and the eminent virtue of his political life, were every where acknowledged and incessantly employed. Great duties, in rapid succession, were thrust upon him. These were as diligently discharged as they were nobly accepted. The surge of the deadly epidemic, finding him at his post, swept him thence immediately to the grave—his last thoughts turning to the loved ones whose faces he was not permitted to behold again in the flesh.

Upon a mind, originally of considerable force, he conferred the habits and tastes of the scholar. Literary research was perhaps more entirely his delight, and brought him a more unalloyed satisfaction, than to any other man among us. His conversation was enriched with apt quotations from good books, including the best of Books; and imbued with a serious—often a religious—spirit. Though not a member of the Church—restrained from open profession by excessive sensitiveness to the responsibility involved, and by the shrinking of a timid conscience from the possibility of unworthy entrance there—there is little reason to doubt his genuine piety. They who knew him most intimately remit him to the heavenly rest with the most confident hope.

Of the book before us, it must be said that it was the pleasure and the toil of his maturer years. Every effort was cheerfully made to secure needful information from the highest sources. The libraries of both continents were diligently examined, and the facts obtained as nearly as possible at first hand. And we learn, with pleasure, that its claims to confidence and respect are frankly acknowledged in Europe already; and that it is admired and praised in France as an authority upon the subject whereof it treats.*

* It is reported that the Emperor has ordered the work to be translated into his own tongue.

Besides the claims of its eminent author to our especial regard, the "Life and Times of Bertrand du Guesclin" has another impressive adventitious interest. It is the only solid literary production of the South during the memorable four years of the late war. Running the gauntlet of the blockade twice, it left these shores as the gloomy skies began to brighten, and returned to find the clouds of the last catastrophe already risen in the air. Truly an orphan child! it had gladdened but a moment the eyes of its author, when those eyes were closed on all things earthly: and the country of his love, to whose honor he offered it, a willing and precious tribute, outlived him but one little half year.

And it is a coincidence worthy of remark that the time of the book is one of the most memorable periods of civil war in Modern History. Features that recall our own annals meet us continually. Men of the same race, of the same language, even of the same name, were engaged on opposite sides. Men were held in cruel dilemmas, by reason of the penalties impending on either hand. Towns taken and retaken; country held and stripped by alternate armies—by the Black Prince or Bertrand—by Henry of Trastamara or Peter the Cruel—by Charles the Dauphin or Charles the Bad; sorrow, famine, and corroding fear; are the mournful outlines of the story here told.

We gratefully acknowledge the progress God has brought about for us, even as regards civil war, in one respect: the effusion of innocent and helpless blood. The atrocities of that age are almost incredible. The town of Quonquefon is "taken, pillaged, set on fire, and *the inhabitants put to the sword,*" (p. 25, vol. i.) The history of the war of the succession to the Duchy of Brittany, "for the most part, is a painful record of towns and castles taken and retaken, of hamlets and villages pillaged, of churches burnt, of *men, women, and children slain without mercy.*"

But passing over other and inferior enormities, and one that blackens the fair fame of Bertrand du Guesclin himself,* the

* The massacre of Benon. Vol. ii., p. 194.

crowning horror is the sack of Limoges, the crime of Edward the Black Prince:

"As the besieged were taken completely by surprise, the Prince passed without resistance over the broken wall a portion of his troops, who immediately ran to the gate, cut the iron fastenings, and broke down all the barriers. Swollen with dropsy, but deaf to every sentiment of pity towards the inhabitants of the doomed city, Edward caused himself to be conveyed through the gates, accompanied by the Duke of Lancaster, the Earls of Cambridge and Pembroke, the Lord d'Angle, and the great body of his army, who were instructed to spare neither life nor property within the walls of Limoges. This brutal order was carried out to all its fearful consequences before the eyes of the prince, who looked, unmoved by pity or remorse, on the awful spectacle of men, women, and children butchered in cold blood by his stern followers; and when the wretched victims, in their agony, threw themselves at his feet, crying out to him, 'Mercy, gentle Sire!' he turned a deaf ear to their prayers, and suffered the horrid butchery to go on unchecked. 'I do not know,' says Froissart, 'how they could not have had pity on the poor people, who were guilty of no treason; but they paid more dearly for it than the great masters who had committed the offence. There is no one so hardhearted,' he continues, with a just indignation, 'who, if he had been in the city of Limoges, and been mindful of God, would not have wept tenderly at the great mischief which was done there: for more than three thousand persons—men, women and children,—were seized and put to death that day.'" Vol. ii., pp. 132, 133.

No work like this is found among the deeds of the late war; though even this concession awakens an indignant thought of cities shelled at night, (as Petersburg,) or on the Sabbath, (as Chattanooga,) without warning. But for the rest of the evil record—pillaging, burning, deliberate destruction of food,—it may be said in a word that the fourteenth century was born again in the nineteenth.

Not to dwell longer on these sore points, however, let us look a little more closely at the book itself. It is not a history, in the current modern sense of that term; and the tests which are justly applied to those statelier fabrics of modern philosophical thought, would be out of place here. It partakes more of the type of the chronicle—the class in which Froissart, Ayala, and Nangis are found: a species of dioramic writing, where minute

details are not impertinent, but appropriate. The various parties introduced, converse, exclaim, eat, drink, in your presence, without derogation from the proper dignity of the presentor; yet it is at his discretion to arrest the personal exhibition, and enrich his pages with reflections as profound and large as those to which history itself attains.

Thus we have frequent dialogues of dramatic force and vividness; incident as minute and picturesque as the Flemish painters affect. And again we pause, in the turbulent theory of wars, raids, deaths, victories, to gather wisdom, to compare the ages, to add ancient to "modern instances," and to collect, along the paths of history, the lessons of retribution or of mercy. Thus we have an interesting comparison of the English with the French, (vol. i., p. 123); a mournful but just reflection upon the fate of "insurrections of the populace," (*ibid.*, p. 130); a striking, though not entirely satisfactory view of duelling, viewed in its social, rather than its moral relations, (*ibid.*, p. 140); an account of the Art of War, as then known and practised, (*ibid.*, p. 209); and a rich series of ably drawn "characters" of the personages who take part in the drama—of which it will suffice to mention those of the Black Prince and his father, Edward III.; (vol. ii., pp. 261, 263.)

We know not where to find an equally large collection of such judgments, as just in thought, as candid and judicial in expression, as those which adorn these pages. They are not portraits, like Motley's, for the sufficient reason that the plan adopted involves the actors' drawing their own portraits; their words, whether hasty or measured, the expression flitting across their features, their deeds, good and bad, have been already set down; and now, at last, they come up simply for sentence. This is all these characters intend; and this they accomplish.

It is time, however, to say a word of the hero of the book. He is, indeed, the hero of his century, its most consummate production, the flower of that tough and thorny aloe. The memorials of its vices are in some measure visible there; but its best graces are seen as resplendent in no other man of that age, as they are seen in Bertrand du Guesclin.

He was "the son of a poor knight," as he sometimes said; his *banned* son; despised, humiliated, sneered down, denied even a seat with his father's other children at the table. With what a flavor of poetical justice we contrast the boy taking his lonely dinner on a stool, (i. p. 4,) with the Constable of France, risen above the heads of all his fellow-subjects, seated by the king's side, at his own table! (ii., p. 139.) True, he was fortunate in his foils. To have matched and baffled Prince Edward and the Duke of Lancaster in war; to have stood firm in his truth and chivalry, while opposed to such a bloody and treacherous creature as Peter the Cruel; to have been planted as the mighty pillar of the shaken State, on which King Charles should lean as his sole dependence: these are glories to which the circumstances were almost as necessary as his worth and his power. But these very combinations would have ruined him, had he been any less a man, and born king of men, than he was. And there is a thread of happy retribution running through his story that lights it up amid a thousand environing glooms of faithlessness and blood. His open-handed generosity, which bids fair, as it seems, to ruin him, finds its reward in the rush from every quarter to pay his ransom, when taken prisoner. From the landlord of the poor way-side inn to the King of France, and even the Princess of Wales, the wife of his enemy, and his jailor, every noble heart exults in adding what it can to heap up the wealth that shall deliver the deliverer. His unswerving loyalty won at last the absolute confidence of Charles the Wise, the most suspicious of kings—excepting only Louis XI., who trusted no man, because he was true to none; and who was duped, accordingly, from the beginning to the end of his reign. Nor must we fail to add, that having been a marvel of humanity through this long life of combats and violence, when compared with the kindest warriors of his age, it was his lot, appropriately, to die calmly in his bed, surrounded by his friends, and consoled by the offices of his religion. Yet was he a conqueror, even in his death; for "the garrison of Chateau-neuf-de-Randon, who had sworn to deliver up their fortress to him alone, hearing of his death, issued out of the castle, with the captain at their head, entered the tent where

the body of the late Constable was lying, and deposited the keys of the castle on his coffin." (Vol. ii., p. 312.)

"Thus," remarks his historian, "passed away the spirit of an earnest, loyal, and brave man, who found work for him to do in this world, and who did it with his might."

The eminent "*religiosity*"—to borrow Carlyle's word—which characterises that age of crimes, that wide welter of blasphemy, treachery, lust, and murder, suggests a closing remark. Kings "hear mass" and armies pray before battle; solemn oaths are sworn to enforce all sorts of engagements; religion, and its sacredest words, are in every man's mouth: and yet it is a horrible, godless, brutal age. As we contemplate it, we are constrained to feel that a religion cannot be spiritual and sensuous too.

It is a maxim among physicians that the blood cannot do its best work in more than one class of organs at once. If you demand its services in the brain, you must spare it from the stomach; and *vice versa.* And this rule of physical life seems to hold also with respect to the mental. The æsthetic and the spiritual powers are not only not the same, but they are vitally diverse; and to give supremacy to the one, is to wrest it from the other. Thus, a religion that speaks clamorously to the eye and to the ear, is, for that very reason, silent to the heart. It kindles into transient ecstasy the shallower emotions; but to do so, is to drain from the life-centre to the surface. It operates upon perception at the expense of reflection.

It follows, therefore, that the moral and religious standard of such a church must be low; must ever run lower. The sensuous is the parent of the sensual.

We are aware that these truths are not new. Vital truths, at this late day, can hardly be so. But they are ever newly needful; in this, as in the fourteenth century. How fearfully strong is the set of the tide, even now, from the spiritual to the sensuous, from the informal to the ritual! How great the craving, and with how many, for sounds and sights, in worship, that will arrest the attention and charm the sense; while the heart, if it could make itself heard, would whisper, as in ancient time,

"The Lord is in his holy temple: let all the earth keep silence before him!"

There is greatly needed a thorough dissection of that false philosophy of the religious life, by which the practices, the thoughts, the language, of mankind are so seriously affected; and this, not necessarily in any sectarian interest, but because of the incessant tendencies every where from the plain, arduous right to the showy, easy wrong. Isaac Taylor's "Natural History of Enthusiasm" opened the discussion; but he neither went deep enough at the beginning, nor came near enough to the surface at the conclusion, to do the work he undertook—to describe, and by describing effectually to discountenance, "fictitious piety."

This, however, is a digression. We return for a moment to the work before us. It would have been a great delight to render thanks to the author of this excellent book for the pleasure and instruction it has afforded us: but far better is he, as he is! He is gone, we will not doubt, into that realm where the offices of human friendship are unnecessary, and where the voice of human praise of a human brother, would be indeed a strange and unwelcome interruption. But to the living we gladly commend it, for its refined thought, its transparent diction, its stores of pleasant lore and judicious reflection. Even its hero, wild as are his ethics, and stormy as was his life, is not unworthy to furnish at least a point of departure for the purposes of aspiring and gallant youth to-day. Let such a man resolve within his heart, "I will be no less truthful, earnest, brave, than was he who thus glimmers out upon me from the darkness of five hundred years ago." But let him add a nobler covenant to this: "By the grace of God, the gospel light, which now irradiates the world, shall not be lost upon me. I will learn the power of gentleness and spiritual wisdom. I will seek a better work than steadying a tottering and wicked throne, or hurling a bloody tyrant, whose breath is in his nostrils, from his seat. Be it mine to serve the Immortal King; to breathe his spirit, and to advance his cause. Let me strive to put down wickedness within me and without; to bind up men's wounds, to comfort the sorrowing and broken-

hearted; to make ignorance, superstition, and vice spread their dusky wings, and vanish with the vanishing twilight of man's day. So shall my sleep be sweet, and my life fruitful; so shall my blessings be as royal as my Master is divine."

ARTICLE V.

NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN VIEWS OF THE PROVINCE OF THE CHURCH.

The last time we had occasion to express ourselves in these pages on the subject of instructions from the courts of the Church to her members relative to their duty to the government, was when we took occasion to retract, in some sense, a previous utterance. In July, 1861, immediately after the breaking out of the war, we had maintained that the General Assembly, which met that spring in Philadelphia, was not only at liberty to speak of the war, but was bound to declare itself respecting such a great wrong, pregnant with so many and such sins and curses. The error of that body, we said, was not its speaking, but its speaking in the wrong way; for it condemned whom we judged it should have justified, and it justified whom we judged it should have condemned. But we insisted that it must justify and must condemn, when such appalling sin was in process of commission. Further reflection, however, carried on as best we might in the midst of all the excitements of that period, led us in the ensuing October number to modify this language, and we then confessed (using Calvin's expression regarding the doctrine of election,) how "involved and intricate" we found the question of the Church courts' power and duty in the premises.

There seems, indeed, some inherent perplexity in this subject,

arising out of the fact that behind the moral question of duty, there often lies a political one which yet may seem to the fallible court to be no question at all. The duty of obedience to government is a clear one, and every Church court is bound to enforce it, just as it must enforce the duty of children or servants towards parents or masters. But there the proper parties to whom obedience is due are always and easily known, whilst it is not always clear who is the Cæsar that has a claim on our loyalty. But it may appear clear to the members of the fallible court; and in such a case it would seem to follow that the court has a right, nay, is under obligation, to testify to the duty that flows out of this lawful authority which it thus clearly recognises. For how can the Church forbear to warn and to exhort her children to do their whole duty, as well of the second as of the first table of the law? She may not handle anything political, but here the political requires no handling. It is obvious and plain. That is all settled before she begins to consider the case. And the matter which she takes up and handles is a clear case of duty to magistrates which is not political, but ecclesiastical and moral. If, for example, the General Assembly at Philadelphia, in May, 1861, perceived nothing doubtful in the claims of the United States government upon the seceded States; if those States and their people were in its view all in rebellion against just authority justly exercised, then such rebellion being sinful, that Assembly could not but regard it a just subject of ecclesiastical censure. The case was as clear in this sense to the whole Assembly, except Dr. Hodge and those who protested with him, as any case they had ever decided. Nor did they undertake to handle any political question at all. They verily believed that they were deciding only what was ecclesiastical in the highest and truest sense. It was, in their apprehension, just as when a church member is adjudged to be guilty of adultery or theft. In such a case, the court that so judges him acts upon a previous judgment, which may, however, be incorrect, as to the lawfulness of the claim of those against whom it concludes him to be an offender. That previous judgment is upon the secular question whether those persons were indeed the one of them his wife,

or the other the owner of something stolen by him. Synods may not handle secular matters; yet, when they lie thus at the bottom of things ecclesiastical, it is very difficult, and might almost seem impossible to avoid acting upon previous conclusions respecting them.

If, on the other hand, in secession decreed already with one voice by the people of South Carolina, and lacking only the formal vote of the Convention, the Synod of South Carolina, (met at Charleston in November, 1860,) discovered a movement in defence of the sacred rights of constitutional freedom, which duty to God, to the nations, and to posterity, required should be defended from the dreadful hazards to which they seemed to be exposed—if all this appeared to the Synod to be only a moral and religious question, a question of duty on the part of the members of their churches to the State which sheltered and protected them, as well as claimed their first allegiance, then it became to them an ecclesiastical matter of the greatest moment, clearly within their province for decision and for action.

Now we say, these courts, being fallible, are always liable to err in supposing that to be only a religious and moral question which is yet a doubtful political one, outside of their proper sphere of action as courts of Jesus Christ. And this is all the more likely to take place in times of profound excitement of the public mind, when the passions of all are roused to an uncontrollable height.

It is the universal conviction, we believe, of Southern Presbyterians that the General Assembly met at Philadelphia in 1861, did thus err; for its action in the "Spring" resolutions took for granted as correct a certain political theory of the Constitution of the United States, which yet had been denied and rejected by thousands of American citizens all over the country, from the very formation of the Constitution. This doubtful theory taken for granted, a declaration of political sentiments was made, and made for the whole Church represented by the Assembly, and thus, practically, a new term of church membership and communion was enacted and set up, so far as the Assembly could do such a thing. But the record of that As-

sembly's political deliverances did not end, but only began here. In 1862, Dr. Breckinridge's paper, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority, undertook to instruct the government respecting the policy it ought to pursue towards the South; decided the question of the structure of the government as "national"; and made the Church a subject of the State by its language concerning the "loyalty of the Church" and the "loyal Presbyteries and Synods," as if the Church of Christ owed loyalty to any but to her sole Head. Again, in 1863, the Assembly, by another overwhelming majority, proclaimed to the world its union with the government, declaring, on behalf of the Church, that the United States, one and undivided, was its country; their rulers, its rulers; their government, its government; and their flag, its flag. Moreover, in accordance with this declaration about the flag, they allowed and encouraged the trustees of the church where they were meeting to raise the United States flag over the building. Again, in 1864, the Assembly, with almost entire unanimity, decided what was the object of the war on the part of the South, viz., to found an empire on the corner-stone of slavery; and also gave judgment that emancipation was necessary for the preservation of our own liberty and independence. And finally, in 1865, the Assembly set up new terms of Church fellowship and ministerial communion, applicable, however, not alike to both North and South, but only to the latter. The body placed its own opinions of the war and of slavery on a level with the rules of Christ concerning admission into his fold. Having, in 1863, declared itself the creature of the government, and so dethroned the Lord Jesus, now, in 1865, it seems disposed to make disloyalty to its new head, viz. Cæsar, the synonym of all sin.

Thus we find this Church court, through a series of years, persevering in the utterance of political decrees, and reiterating and intensifying, as the war rolled on, its testimonies of loyalty, not to Christ, but to a head upon the earth. The thing is not done once, in the heat of passion, or through inadvertency, but it is done over and over, deliberately, and of set purpose.

When we turn to the Synod of South Carolina, and undertake, after an interval of over five years, to examine the deliverance it gave in 1860, which has been so much criticised,* we think it must strike every candid person that it was the *intention* of the Synod not to handle any thing but what was ecclesiastical. An express disclaimer is made of any right to take up political questions. And what was said by the Synod relative to secession, was spoken expressly in regard to the religious aspect of it, as that step was demanded, in the Synod's judgment, by duty to God, to our slaves, and to posterity. If the Synod erred, it was in conceiving of secession in that aspect; there certainly does not appear in the deliverance any manifestation of the intention or the claim to handle what is secular or political. Nor do the subsequent Minutes of the Synod, in the following years of the war, record any reference at all to political questions, or exhibit any handling of secular affairs.

And how has it been with the General Assembly set up in the States which seceded? At their first meeting in Augusta, they set forth articulately their views of the necessity of a "rigorous exclusion of the questions and passions of the forum from the halls of debate," and they traced to the neglect of this clear and plain duty by the Assembly at the North, the necessity which had arisen for the ecclesiastical separation. And every direct act of that Assembly, since that time, has been in accordance with the principle thus enunciated. It is true that twice in the narratives, there are expressions which some might signalize as inconsistent with the principle of rigorous exclusion above referred to. One of these cases was in 1862, at Montgomery, where the narrative speaks of the fact that our congregations were in "cordial sympathy with the people of the Confederate States" in their great struggle, and that the churches generally in our connexion "were deeply convinced that this struggle

---

*NOTE. It is due to historical truth to state here, in contradiction of many statements made on the subject at the North, that Dr. Thornwell was not present at this meeting of Synod, and of course has no responsibility whatever for its action now under consideration.

was not alone for civil rights and property and home, but also for our religion, for the Church, for the gospel, and for existence itself," and then proceeds to say, "The Assembly desires to record, with its solemn approval, this fact of the unanimity of our people in supporting a contest to which religion as well as patriotism now summons the citizens of this country, and to implore for them the blessing of God in the course which they are now pursuing." Here was a solemn testimony encouraging Church members to persevere in what the Assembly believed to be the course of duty. These Church members were supporting the government under which they lived, and the government of their choice and affections, during a most fearful assault upon it from without, and to the Assembly at Montgomery it seemed to be proper to stimulate the zeal and hopes of their people in the arduous duty due from these people to their Cæsar. There is surely nothing political or secular here—no committing of the Church represented by the Assembly to the policy of any administration; no instructions or advice to government respecting the course it should pursue; no decision of the true nature of the government, or of any other constitutional or political questions; no declarations about the Church's loyalty to Cæsar; no adoption of any flag for the Church; and no setting up of any new terms of Church or ministerial fellowship, based upon conformity to any merely human notions about politics or other secular affairs. Upon the plain question of duty to the powers that be, this Assembly uttered itself, as it supposed was proper, in giving instructions to its flock.

The other case was in 1864, when the Assembly at Charlotte, speaking in their narrative of *the spiritual welfare* of our slaves, and the duties we owed to them, expressed its "conviction of the divine appointment of domestic servitude." Is their anything strange or unheard of in that sentiment? Is that a new idea amongst those who receive the Christian Scriptures? "We hesitate not to affirm," proceeded the Assembly, "that it is the peculiar mission of the Southern Church to conserve the institution of slavery, and to make it a blessing both to master and to slave. We could not, if we would, yield up these four millions

of immortal beings to the dictates of fanaticism, and to the menaces of military power. We distinctly recognise the inscrutable providence which brought this benighted people into our midst, and we shall feel that we have not discharged our solemn trust until we have used every effort to bring them under the saving influences of the gospel of Christ." Was there anything very bad in all this? And this is every word which the Assembly said. Slavery, as opening to us a missionary field of four millions of souls, to whom we were bound to preach the gospel, was an institution having moral and religious aspects of the most conspicuous and manifest importance. In reference to this sense of the term *alone* was the Assembly asserting anything respecting it. Fanaticism was dictating that the tie which bound us to this people and them to us—which tie constituted the peculiar obligation that rested on us, and also gave us the peculiar opportunity we enjoyed of discharging the obligation—fanaticism was dictating to us that that tie should be dissolved, and military power was threatening to enforce the dictate. The Assembly, considering that tie the institute of a beneficent, although mysterious Providence, which had brought already, and was still bringing great good out of this relation; and considering it simply and purely an utterance of infidelity thus to denounce as essentially and necessarily evil what God's word clearly sanctioned; which infidelity, however disguised, the Church of Christ was bound to oppose;—the Assembly, so considering, testified at Charlotte in her narrative, that we had no right voluntarily to cast off the obligations God had imposed on us in this relation, and yield up to every kind of injury and suffering these people committed to our care. In this aspect of their language, which is manifestly its true and proper aspect, it was no political, but a religious utterance. And in this aspect of the institution, slavery was to the Church, indeed, a sacred and solemn trust, as the Assembly represented it. God, in his providence, did commit this trust to the Southern Church, to take care of it, to "conserve" it, that is, as the dictionaries define that word, *to keep it sound and safe*, nay, to improve it, and make it more and more a blessing to both master

and slave, and never to give over our efforts to bring all these immortal beings under the saving influences of the gospel of Christ.

Besides these two utterances, made thus incidentally in two of its narratives, there is absolutely nothing in the whole proceedings of our Assembly, during all its five sessions, which at all resembles a "handling of what is not ecclesiastical."

As to the proceedings of other Church courts at the South, we have very little positive knowledge, except that a member of the Synod of Georgia, quite competent to speak, informs us that his Synod have carefully abstained, all through the war, from touching anything political or secular. We will take it upon us, however, to say that it is not probable any of these Synods or Presbyteries have erred in this manner, for it is fair to judge those from whom we have not heard directly on this subject, by the Presbyteries and Synods of South Carolina and of Georgia, about which we are well informed. And without any such specimens to judge by, we might reasonably suppose they would all alike take especial pains to avoid the very error which led them to break away from the Northern Assembly, and set up a Church of their own.

Such is the true history, so far as we are able to give it, of the conduct of Southern Synods and Assemblies touching non-ecclesiastical affairs. Dr. Hodge, in the October number of his Review, makes very strong charges against us relative to this matter. Speaking of ecclesiastical bodies which had freely expressed themselves, "Even the special advocates of the spirituality of the Church," he says, "who professed to have washed their hands of all secular concerns, have been the most pronounced in their opinions, and the most vehement and pertinacious in advocating them." (P. 627.) "Synods pledged themselves to the support of the new Confederacy, and in short the whole Church South was possessed and animated by what its members regarded the spirit of patriotism and loyalty, to the almost entire exclusion, as it appeared to their Northern brethren, of the spirit of the gospel." (Pp. 646, 647.) And in the July number, "Southern Presbyterian Synods and General

Assemblies, to the great sorrow and chagrin of their Northern brethren, have been among the foremost in the assertion of extreme Southern doctrines, and in the manifestation of sectional jealousy. * * * * Such is our poor human nature." (P. 506.) Now, we do not lay claim to any exemption for our Southern Church from the frailties of our poor human nature, but we have to acknowledge sins and imperfections enough that really do belong to us, without having fastened upon us what are not truly ours. And seeing that, so far as we know or believe, the Southern Church courts have been free from this particular fault, whilst Northern Synods, by Dr. Hodge's own showing, (October number, p. 644,) and the Northern Assembly, according to his own protest, have flagrantly erred in this particular, it does seem rather too bad that we should be held up by Dr. Hodge as shocking our immaculate Northern brethren with our excesses in this regard. This brings to our recollection how the Doctor, in his eulogy upon President Lincoln, solemnly declared that "Since the death of Christ, no such dogma stains the record of any ecclesiastical body" as the statement we quoted above, from our Assembly's narrative at Charlotte! Alas, for "our poor human nature," when a great and good and wise man, and minister, could allow himself, carried away by the fervor of his political zeal, to say of such a statement as that, "It is enough to humble the whole Christian world to hear our Presbyterian brethren of the South declaring that the great mission of the Southern Church was to conserve the system of African slavery"! (July number, p. 439.) Surely it is not worthy of Dr. Hodge to visit upon his Southern Presbyterian brethren this injustice of isolating a particular expression, and forcing upon it a meaning contrary to that of the whole passage which they wrote. And surely it is equally unworthy of him to commit so great an injustice upon truth, as to hold up to the scorn of the Christian world a paragraph expressing sentiments so sound, so true, so Christian, as this whole passage sets forth.

It is very strong language which Dr. Hodge employs. What our Assembly at Charlotte said, is not only not sound, nor true, nor Christian, but it is a stain upon our records, and a stain

unparalleled by anything in the records of any ecclesiastical body since the death of Christ! Dr. Hodge is somewhat given to this kind of *dicta.* He loves to speak for the whole Church in all ages, and by broad and sweeping assertions of this sort to crowd down opposition to his views; although it is not often that he has allowed himself to be quite so extravagant. There was a council that decreed the refusal of the cup to the laity. And there was another that established seven sacraments, auricular confession, and the apocrypha. There were councils which enacted image-worship, and denounced penalties on all who should maintain that adoration is due only to God. And there were councils which decreed the extirpation of heretics with fire and sword, and carried their decree into execution in numerous cases. All these, and others like these, were dreadful stains upon the records of the Church. But not one of these was equal to the stain which disgraces the Assembly at Charlotte, in its conservative declarations respecting the relation of master and slave: that solemn trust which was not to be voluntarily surrendered, but on the contrary was to be maintained, and also kept from degenerating into a curse, nay, to be improved and made a blessing, while in the use and employment of all the advantages it afforded, untiring efforts were to be made on behalf of those immortal beings, to bring them all under the saving influence of the gospel! Surely Dr. Hodge, the judicious, the moderate, the sober, was under some strange hallucination, under some mighty spell, when he could express himself with such inconsiderate heat!

But how stands the matter of the Christian Church's relation in all past ages to the particular subject of slavery? Is this the first and only time that the Church of Christ was ever known to assume the conservative attitude regarding slavery? Does Dr. Hodge intend to be understood, in this very strong expression, as saying that the Church of Christ has in all ages set herself in unqualified opposition to that institution? We could not have supposed it possible for Dr. Hodge to forget so completely what of course he knows so well, that the very contrary is the truth. One high authority tells us, "Slavery subsisted a

long time in the bosom of Christian society, without any great horror or irritation being expressed against it.* Biot, in his prize essay, says "No Christian writers of the first three centuries speak of the abolition of slavery as a consequence of Christianity."† Babington, in his Hulsean prize essay, says, "It is evident that the early Christians did not consider servitude as in the abstract improper. This, indeed, scarcely requires proof, inasmuch as it has just been remarked that even martyrs possessed slaves. * * * * * * * Nay, more, the infant Church gave little encouragement to manumission. (1.) The apostolic constitutions distinctly assume that a Christian will retain his slaves in his service. (2.) Ignatius tells bondmen and bondwomen not to wish to be made free at the expense (of the Church) lest they be found the servants of lust."‡ The same writer says, "It must occasion no surprise to discover that all civil and ecclesiastical authority from the time of Constantine downwards, sanction slavery."‖ He says of the first two centuries of the Christian era, that "the propriety of slavery was not called in question, nor were manumissions even encouraged."§ He quotes Theodoret as "maintaining that slavery has been on the whole beneficial to man in his fallen state," and naming in connexion with Theodoret, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Basil, Ephrem the Syrian, Leo the Great, and others, he says, "Not one of the writers above mentioned even hints that slavery is unlawful or improper."** Isidore of Pelusium, not giving his own counsel, but paraphrasing the apostle Paul, advises slaves if they might be made free, nevertheless to prefer slavery.†† In like manner Chrysostom says,

---

* Guizot, Civilis. en Europe, Lect. vi., p. 14, ed. 1828.

† De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage ancien en occident. Examen des Causes Principales, &c. Paris, 1840: p. 26.

‡ Babington's Influence of Christianity in promoting the Abolition of Slavery in Europe. Cambridge, 1846: pp. 22, 23.

‖ Ibid. p. 25.

§ Ibid. p. 179.

** Ibid. pp. 26—29.

†† Lib. iv.: Epist. 12.

"On this account the blessed Paul, when giving them (slaves) the best counsel said, 'Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather,'—that is, abide in slavery."* And Jerome, Theodoret, and others of the fathers, took the same view of the apostle's meaning. Indeed, as Babington remarks, this sense, it must be confessed, suits the context admirably, not to add that the original particle commonly signifies not "if" but "although."†

But what we have referred to so far, are, for the most part, but the sentiments of individuals in the early Church, while Dr. Hodge's strong assertion relates to "ecclesiastical bodies." Let us point, then, to the Council of Gangra, in the fourth century, which deposed Eustathius for "teaching slaves, under pretext of religion, to withdraw from their masters' service," and pronounced "anathema upon all such." The Magdeburg Centuriators say of this case, "To alienate slaves from their masters was judged to be a sin, and worthy indeed of excommunication; witness the case of Eustathius, who was deposed by the Council of Gangra, because he took away slaves from their masters." They quote Socrates thus: "Under the pretext of piety, he also seduced slaves from their masters."

Let us refer to the Council of Agatho, in the sixth century, which decreed that "The slaves of monasteries might never be emancipated, since it was unjust that the monks being obligated to daily toil, their slaves should enjoy ease and freedom."

Let us refer to the Council of Jena, in the same century, which decreed the same law in the same words.

Let us refer to the Council of Seville, in the seventh century, which said "The freedmen of the Church, becoming proud, are ordered to be remanded to slavery."

And let us refer to Canon 70, of the Excerpts of Egbert, Archbishop of York, "To an abbot or monk, it is not lawful to set free a slave of the monastery. For it is impious that one

---

* Chrysostom's Introduct. to Homily on Philemon.

† Babington, p. 15, note.

who has not conferred wealth upon the Church should bring her loss."

The originals of these quotations may be found in the note.* These are a few specimens of the ancient Church's action respecting slavery. They have cost but little research, and, we are sure, could easily be multiplied. We submit that Dr. Hodge's allegation does not bear examination. He spoke too fast, and his words were over strong. He was unjust to his brethren in distorting their language, and then exaggerating the crime he had constructively fastened upon them. But he is not sustained in his loose declamatory condemnation of us by the records to which he has himself appealed. The Christian Church did indeed contribute powerfully to the abolition of slavery; but it was indirectly, and still more, it was slowly and gradually. Her position always was *conservative* on that question, as was our Assembly's at Charlotte, for which Dr. Hodge now joins with radicals in their hue and cry against us. Babington says it took *one thousand years* of the constant influence of Christianity upon society to cause strict personal slavery to *begin* to

---

* "Si quis docet servum pietatis prætextu dominum contemnere et a ministerio recedere, et non cum benevolentia et omni honore domino suo inservire, sit anathema." Concil. Gangr. Can. 61. Binius, Tom. i., fol. 153.

"Servos ab heris suis abalienare, peccatum judicabatur et quidem excommunicatione dignum. Testatur id exemplum Eustathii, qui a synodo Gangrensi ideo quod dominis servos abstulisset, depositus est." Hist. Eccles. Magdeb. Cent. iv. Cap. vi. 260 F.

"Mancipia vero monachis donata, ab abbate non liceat manumitti. Injustum enim putamus ut monachis quotidianum rurale opus facientibus, servi eorum libertatis otio potiantur." Concil. Agath. Can. 56. Binius, Tom. iii. 716 E. See also Concil, Epaon. Can. 8. Binius, Tom. iii. 726 B.

"Liberti ecclesiae superbientes ad servitium revocari jubentur." Spalensis Concilii ii. Actione 8. Hist. Eccles. Magdev. Cent. vii.

"Abbati vel monacho, monasterii servum non licet facere liberum. Impium est, ut qui res Ecclesiae non contulerit, damnum inferat." Excerpt. Ecqb. Archiep. Ebor. Can. 70. (A. D. 750.) Spelm. Concil. Tom. i., p. 265.

disappear in most parts of Europe.* One may discover the proofs of the Church's moderation upon this subject scattered every where along the track of her records. And when we ascend to the very beginning of her history, we find the inspired apostle, in 1 Tim. vi., writing about slaves and slavery in the same conservative strain, and indeed commanding Timothy to withdraw from communion with all who would not consent to "wholesome words," that is, his *conservative* teachings upon this subject. We submit now to Dr. Hodge, whether the Church of God, the Bride, the Lamb's wife, as represented by the Assembly at Charlotte, being chargeable with no other fault than expressing herself after Paul's conservative fashion on this subject, he was warranted in accusing her, before God and man, as having uttered a dogma, the like of which stains the records of no ecclesiastical body since the death of Christ.

As to the statement of Dr. Hodge, made upon "credible information," that the "pulpits of the South rang perpetually with political harangues, *i. e.* harangues designed to fire the Southern heart in the great struggle," (October number, p. 646,) we are free to say that we are satisfied Dr. Hodge has been misinformed. There may have been some political preaching by some few of our brethren during the war, but we believe there was far less of it in the case of any one of them than Dr. Hodge's information would signify. For be it remembered that all sides agree that the duty of loyalty to acknowledged government may be enforced by the pulpit as also by the Church courts. And so, if our brethren were led to hold up before their flocks the duty of obeying and supporting the *de facto* government under which they lived, and which they acknowledged to be also their government *de jure;* if they preached patience under privations, and hope in God amidst discouragements, and patriotic zeal in defending homes and firesides against the invader; if they expounded God's word as it sanctions slavery, and taught their people to commit the cause they were maintaining against a radical infidelity in humble prayer to his wise, and

* Hulsean Prize Essay, p. 180.

sovereign, and merciful arbitrament; we do not see that any part or all of this can be condemned as a preaching of politics. Speaking, however, of the Southern Presbyterian pulpit in general, we feel very confident that it did not ring with any other sound than the preaching of the Cross. To what extent could this be asserted with truth of the Presbyterian pulpit at the North? Has not the good Doctor been too ready to judge the Southern pulpit, of which, personally, he could know nothing, by what he knows to be true of the Northern? We make no assertions, but we very strongly suspect that just by so much as his account of the Southern pulpit is a very gross exaggeration of what perhaps existed to some degree amongst us, by so much does it fall short of describing the fiery and bloodthirsty spirit of a large part of the Presbyterian ministry at the North. How many of them could plead that the nearest approach which they ever made to political preaching was to urge their people to defend their country from invasion, and support their government in a purely defensive war?

There was one error, however, into which we acknowledge that some Southern ministers sometimes fell, not so much in our own, as in some other churches. It can not be doubted that Southern ministers, as well as other Christians, for the most part, believed honestly and earnestly in the justice of the Southern cause. The error of some was in allowing themselves to receive the popular idea, and to encourage that idea amongst all Christian people, that God must surely bless the right. They forgot how frequently it seems good to his infinite wisdom and sovereign pleasure to suffer the righteous to be overthrown. This lesson, taught by all history, both sacred and profane, they could not receive in its application to a cause which seemed to them so pre-eminently just. Here, in their view, was a cruel, unjust, and wicked war of invasion upon free States, and they sister States also, urged on, in great part, by an infidel fanaticism. They took it for granted that the Almighty would never allow such a cause to triumph. They prayed fervently for the success of the Confederacy, and they never doubted that their prayers would be heard. They stimulated the hopes and the

zeal of their flocks in the service of their government, and in preaching, as they were authorised to preach, this plain duty, they left no room for any to question but that, faithfully performed, God must and would crown all with success. It was an error. God had revealed no promise on which faith could rest. The patriotic duty to be done, was to be done under the distinct acknowledgment that the result was with God alone, who called to that duty, but had not revealed his own plans or purposes. The consequences of this error have, we apprehend, in many instances been hurtful. Many, both in the army and at home, both male and female, both professors and non-professors of religion, have been tempted to doubts about the whole doctrine of divine providence. They know there was earnest prayer, and united prayer, and importunate prayer, and that there was also confident trust and expectation. Yet all has been disappointment inexpressibly deep and dark. The sad heart turning away from man, is tempted sorely to turn away from God also, as one who hath mocked. These are distressing consequences of a serious error, which may God mercifully forgive and overrule to his glory.

Returning to the main topic of this article, we think it appropriate just here to remark, as evincing the perplexity which appears to be inherent in the question, ~~that~~ Dr. Hodge now seems to make it the only fault of the Assembly of 1861, in the Spring resolutions against which he protested, that the body did not act as became the representatives of a divided constituency. He quotes (Review for October, p. 636,) what he had said on the Assembly's floor, viz., that he would cheerfully vote for that paper if offered in the Synod of New Jersey; and declares (p. 644) that most of the signers of his protest had voted, in their respective Synods and Presbyteries, for still more stringent resolutions, because the people there had no political question to decide, and all which the Synods and Presbyteries required the people under their charge to do, was what the word of God commanded them to do, viz., to be loyal and obedient to the government. He adds that when, in 1862, the Assembly represented the loyal or non-seceding States, it was perfectly competent for that body to

adopt the paper presented by the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, and it was perfectly consistent in him to present that paper, although he had severely denounced the action of the preceding Assembly. "All this," says Dr. Hodge, "seems to us so perfectly plain, that it is a matter of surprise that it ever should be called into question."

Now we are well aware the distinction is just, which is drawn here betwixt the Synod and the Assembly. What in the former is only the inculcation of the duty of loyalty to the acknowledged Cæsar, may yet be in the latter the setting up of new conditions of Church fellowship where the members of the body are divided betwixt two Cæsars, whilst the Assembly undertakes to speak in the name of all who belong to it, and to put into their mouths the language of loyalty to one Cæsar. But what does not "seem to us so perfectly plain" is how Dr. H. could be willing for the Synod of New Jersey to use the language of the Spring resolutions, and declare its obligations as a Synod to perpetuate the integrity of the United States, and to uphold the Federal government in the exercise of its functions; or to profess as a Synod, its unabated loyalty to the Constitution. Nor does it seem to us perfectly plain how he can consider it altogether proper for the Assembly of 1862, although entirely homogeneous, to give instructions to government about crushing the rebellion, or to decide the question of the government's being "national," or to put the Church under the State by talking of her "loyalty."

Another illustration of the perplexity which seems to belong inherently to this question is, that we find a profound and learned writer like Dr. Hodge, after all that he has spoken and written on this subject, now maintaining (Review for October, p. 647,) that he may "heart and soul" embrace the "national cause," and advocate "national principles," not only in the pulpit and in the religious journals, but also in the Church courts; also that it is a "new theory of the Church," and a "false principle," which would deny his right to do this; and still further, that this new theory of the Church is the twin sister of secession; is as dead as secession is, and that both may be

allowed to pass into oblivion together. Dr. Hodge's zeal against what he calls the "new theory" is very lively, and leads him to make some curious statements regarding it. For example, on page 645, he says, "In opposition to the principles above stated, Dr. Thornwell, in the Assembly of 1859, presented a new theory"; and on the next page, that this new doctrine as to the office of the Church was originated to keep slavery out of the Assembly, and was so fiercely advocated after the war began, to keep the Church from throwing herself on the side of the government and the Union. Moreover, as above intimated, he ascribes this new theory to Southern men, and says it would be very difficult to find a single advocate of it who is not a pro-slavery man, and an ardent sympathiser with the South. But if the reader will turn to the *Princeton Review* for 1848, pp. 424–6, he will find recorded there a full and articulate statement of this "new theory" as adopted by the General Assembly of that day, and as the *Review* also tells us, "on motion of Dr. Krebs, unanimously." Nay, the reader need only turn to his Confession of Faith, chap. xxxi., sec. 4, and he will find the new theory, so called, there written down by our fathers briefly, but with full and complete distinctness and force.

This "new theory" of Dr. Thornwell's, as the *Princeton Review* itself records his remarks spoken in the General Assembly at Indianapolis in 1859, was "one upon which he had long acted and deemed of immense importance. It was that the Church of God is exclusively a spiritual organisation. Her mission was to promote the glory of God, and the salvation of men. She had nothing to do with the voluntary associations of men for various civil and social purposes that were outside of her pale. Ever since he had been a member of the Church he had believed this, and contended for this, and had steadily resisted associating this Church with outside organisations. The Lord Jesus Christ had never given his Church a commission to be identified with them. She had no mission to become entangled with the kingdoms and the policy of this world. The question of colonization is a question of worldly policy. It is a question upon the merits of which he wished not to speak, but no man

will say that Jesus Christ has given to his ministry a commission to attend to the colonization of races, or to the arrest of the slave trade, or to the mere physical comforts of man. It is not the business of the *Church* to build asylums for the insane and blind. Her mission is to bring men to the cross—to reconcile them to God through the blood of the Lamb—to imbue them with the spirit of the Divine Master, and then send them forth to perform their social duties—to manage society and perform the functions that pertain to their social and civil relations. The Church has no right, no authority to league herself with any of the institutions of the State, or such as have for their object mere secular enterprises. 'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' but let the Church of God lend her energies directly to the accomplishment of her own high and glorious mission. He was willing that Church members should try to do good through any agencies that their consciences may approve, but he wished the Church, as such, to keep herself to her specific work. As the Church of Christ, he desired her to know neither rich nor poor, high nor low, bond nor free, to know neither east nor west, north nor south. 'Let the dead bury their dead,' was the mandate of our Lord to his Church, and the very moment you undertake to implicate this Church with any of the powers of the earth, you endanger her efficiency. At this very General Assembly, we have declined identifying ourselves even with the American Presbyterian Historical Society. We had voted it out. We had voted out the Temperance societies, and he would have the Assembly vote out all the societies of this world, and keep to her proper sphere, and let the societies keep to theirs, and do good in their own way, without asking the Church's co-operation. It is this principle that he deemed absolutely indispensable to the Church's purity and success in her peculiar mission." Dr. Thornwell proceeded to describe the glorious spectacle which our Church was at that hour presenting to the country and to the world. She was "standing pre-eminent, the great conservative power of this land, the great bond of union, and witness for the truth, because the only voice she uttered was the word of God. Sir, the salt that is to save

this country is the Church of Christ—a Church that does not mix up with any political party, or any issues aside from her direct mission. Like the ocean, she purifies even by her agitation, whilst acting within her bounds and banks. But like the ocean, too, if she break beyond them, nothing can be more destructive or desolating. Let the Church work on at the very foundations of moral and spiritual influences, which are the foundations of society. Let her do her appropriate and appointed work, and she will sanctify the world. But let her go out of her sphere, and affect interference with the temporalities of men, and she will fail. Whenever she forgets that her mission is to bring men to the cross and to salvation, she comes down from her high vantage ground. Whenever the Church speaks at all, she must speak in the name of the Lord, and she must speak what the Lord bids her." "Show me," said he, "that the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded the Church to engage in the business of transferring men from one place to another, and I will yield and unite in the effort. But until you convince me that this is the business that the Head of the Church hath committed to her, I must earnestly resist any proposal to identify her with such business."

Such was this "new theory," *so-called*, of the Church's sphere which Dr. Thornwell propounded in the Assembly at Indianapolis. Of course, it is manifest that when he speaks of "the Church," he means the Church courts. The doctrine is, (as expressed by the General Assembly of 1848,) that these courts were "ordained by God for spiritual purposes, and must not be made subsidiary to the schemes of any associations founded in the human will, and liable to all its changes and caprices. These societies must make their appeal, not to Church courts, but to Church members."

Now, this clear and just statement of the true nature and functions of the Church, Dr. Hodge asserts to be a new theory. He pays too high a compliment to secession and the Southern mind, when he declares it to be the twin sister of the one, and the child of the other. It is the offspring of eternal truth, the revelation of God in his holy word. Would God that the Church

to which Dr. Thornwell addressed such words of wisdom and of truth, had held fast by these ancient moorings! Would God that his prophetic warnings to her had not been so fully and so sadly realised!

Dr. Hodge makes bold to assert that the "new theory" is "so palpably unsound and untenable, that it was rejected by a unanimous vote in the Assembly of 1860"—the very first one after that into which Dr. Thornwell had succeeded in introducing his "new and startling doctrine." Let the reader compare with this allegation, the official record of the Assembly's action referred to. (See p. 44, Minutes for 1860.) It is as follows:

"Overture No. 32, several memorials and overtures referred to the Committee relating to Colonization, Temperance, the Slave Trade, &c.

"The Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution, viz.:

"*Resolved*, That while the General Assembly, on the one hand, disclaim all right to interfere in secular matters; and on the other, assert the right and duty of the Church, as God's witness on earth, to bear her testimony in favor of truth and holiness, and against all false doctrines and sin, wherever professed or committed, yet in view of the often repeated action of the Assembly in reference to the subjects above referred to, it is inexpedient to take any further action in relation thereto. Adopted unanimously." Here the Assembly "votes out" as Dr. Thornwell expressed it, all secular affairs. This is one part of the "new theory." Here also, the Assembly asserts its duty and right to be God's witness on earth to testify for all his truth, and against all false doctrine, for all holiness and against all sin. This was the other part of the "new theory." So that here we have the whole of it, set forth in plain words. Yet Dr. Hodge has the hardihood to assert that this was "a unanimous rejection of the new theory as palpably unsound and untenable." Because the Assembly, (inconsistently perhaps,) refers in a general way to its past deliverances as harmonious and sufficient, Dr. Hodge ventures to declare roundly that they rejected as "palpably

unsound and untenable" a doctrine articulately expressed in both parts of the very overture they adopted.

This is very similar to his other allegation, that the doctrine of the Church's spiritual nature was held and stated by Dr. Thornwell in such a "restricted" sense as to prevent her from testifying against all sin, and for all righteousness. (Review, October, p. 645.) The reader can judge for himself how far restricted was the sense Dr. Thornwell attached to the term *spiritual* on the occasion of his speech at Indianapolis. Were it needful, we could easily prove, from his other writings, that Dr. Hodge's representations on this point are altogether unjust. Dr. Thornwell's doctrine was none other than what Dr. Hodge himself frequently declares, but the latter is not at all times consistent with his own positions.* He has no fixed principles upon the

---

* NOTE.—For example, Dr. Hodge in one place says:

"The limits assigned to the power of Church courts are all determined, directly or indirectly, by the word of God. Deriving all their authority from that source, they can rightly claim nothing but what is therein granted. As they are Church courts, their authority is confined to the Church. It does not extend to those that are without. It follows, also, from the same premises, that being Church courts, they must be confined in their jurisdiction to Church matters. They have nothing to do with matters of commerce, agriculture, or the fine arts, nor with the affairs of the State. They can only expound and apply the word of God to matters of truth and duty, and to the reforming of abuses, or to the discipline of offences. They may make orders for the conduct of public worship, and the administration of God's house.

"With regard to the proper sphere of the Church's action, we have the plain and easily applicable rule derived from the nature of the Church, and the design of its institution. It is the company of God's professing people, together with their children. It was instituted to teach, maintain, and propagate the truth. Every thing, therefore, which is without the sphere of the divine teaching, is foreign to the Church. Every thing to which that teaching applies, is within her legitimate cognizance. Whatever may be proved to be false by the word of God, the Church is bound to denounce as error. Whatever the Scriptures declare to be truth, the Church is called upon to urge on the faith of all who can hear her voice. And in like manner, she is authorised and bound to press upon the consciences of men, whatever the law of God pronounces to be morally right, and to warn them against whatever the same authority declares to be morally wrong." Review for October, pp. 642–3.

Here Dr. Hodge himself very fully and clearly enunciates the "new theory." But a few pages afterwards, excited by his zeal against the "originators and advocates" of this same new theory, he declares they had been "forced to abandon it," for Dr. Thornwell himself, and the pulpits of the South generally, had preached politics, and the Southern Church papers

subject, but veers about with the varying winds which blow upon him. His position has been one of great difficulty, having, as he once wrote to a Southern friend, "an audience at the North also, to please." To speak to two different and differing congregations, one before, and the other behind a man, gathered together at the same time, and yet address both acceptably, is indeed a hard task; and it has exceeded all Dr. Hodge's acknowledged powers. We believe he will be held responsible, in great part, by posterity, for the Church's swinging loose from her former safe and sure ground. His celebrated "Assault upon the South, and Defence of Anti-slavery and Abolitionism," as Dr. C. C. Jones well termed it, published first in his Review for January, 1861, and afterwards distributed by thousands of copies in pamphlet form, had all the importance which its author claims for it, (Review for October, pp. 628–9,) in dividing both the Church and the country. He has, time and again, of late years, sowed plentifully of the seeds of radicalism, and already begins to reap his harvest.*

---

and Synods had erred in the same way. Then, (forgetting in his great earnestness, what he had written a few pages before,) he proceeds:

"We do not blame those brethren for violating a false principle, and disregarding their own erroneous theory, but we protest against their condemning in others what they justify in themselves. If they may preach and write to prove that slavery is a 'divine institution,' we may endeavor to prove that it is a 'low state of civilisation,' from which the slaves should be elevated and delivered as soon as possible. If they may, heart and soul, embrace the Southern cause, and advocate Southern principles in the pulpit, in Church courts, and in the religious journals, we may do the same for the national cause and national principles. There is, however, no room for debate on this subject. This new theory of the Church is as practically dead, (except for the purpose of faction,) as is the theory of secession, and both, as Siamese twins, may be allowed to pass into oblivion together."

* NOTE.—We append here, by way of note, for the gratification of our readers, another comprehensive and beautiful statement of the doctrine of the province of the Church, as held by Dr. Thornwell, taken from a report which he presented to his own Synod in November 1851. A comparison may thus be made conveniently with Dr. Hodge's statement of it in part first (but not part second) of the preceding note, and the complete identity of the two statements discovered.

"What, then, is the Church? It is not, as we fear too many are disposed to regard it, a moral institute of universal good, whose business it is to wage war upon every form of human ill, whether social, civil, political, or moral,

We have freely criticised Dr. Hodge's October article. He made very free with us, Southern men and Southern Presbyterians, our opinions, conduct, situation, prospects; very free with one of us, especially, who, though dead, yet lives and speaks, whose immortal teachings can never die, and whose name and memory are all the dearer to us, for the injustice and the unkindness which he has received from the Northern Presbyterian Assembly, and the Northern Presbyterian press. But, at the same time, this October article of Dr. Hodge, on some points, attracts us strongly to him. We agree very cordially with much that he says upon his fifth topic. The contents of pp. 642–3, and also of pp. 647—651, we very heartily and earnestly approve. And so we also cordially accept what he declares about the union of the churches, pp. 651–53. But, besides these points of agreement betwixt us, the general character of

---

and to patronise every expedient which a romantic benevolence may suggest as likely to contribute to human comfort, or to mitigate the inconveniences of life. We freely grant, and sincerely rejoice in the truth, that the healthful operations of the Church, in its own appropriate sphere, react upon all the interests of man, and contribute to the progress and prosperity of society; but we are far from admitting, either that it is the purpose of God that, under the present dispensation of religion, all ill shall be banished from this sublunary state, and earth be converted into a paradise, or that the proper end of the Church is the direct promotion of universal good. It has no commission to construct society afresh, to adjust its elements in different proportions, to rearrange the distribution of its classes, or to change the forms of its political constitutions. The noble schemes of philanthropy which have distinguished Christian nations; their magnificent foundations for the poor, the maimed and the blind; the efforts of the wise and good to mitigate human misery, and to temper justice with mercy in the penal visitations of the law; the various associations that have been formed to check and abate particular forms of evil, have all been quickened into life by the spirit of Christianity. But still, it is not the distinctive province of the Church to build asylums for the needy or insane; to organise societies for the improvement of the penal code, or for arresting the progress of intemperance, gambling, or lust. The problems which the anomalies of our fallen state are continually forcing on philanthropy, the Church has no right directly to solve. She must leave them to the providence of God, and to human wisdom, sanctified and guided by the spiritual influences which it is her glory to foster and cherish. The Church is a very peculiar society—voluntary in the sense that all its members become so, not by constraint, but willingly; but not in the sense that its doctrines, discipline, and order are the creatures of the human will, deriving their authority and obligation from the consent of its members. On the contrary, it has a fixed and unalterable constitution; and that constitution is the word of God. It is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is enthroned in it as a sovereign.

the article is such as excites our sympathy. He is on trial by his own brethren. He has been "widely and severely censured," (p. 656,) and this article constitutes his apology and defence. Dr. Hodge has enemies in his own Church, (also the most bitter foes we have,) who have even threatened his ejection from the chair he has filled so long and so ably, and who would like to destroy his Review. It pains us to hear him compare the latter to a "ball and chain" which he carries, and the "discontinuance of which would be to him a great relief." Notwithstanding many misconceptions and misrepresentations of us, his article nevertheless contains, as does also his July number, many kind expressions towards the South. Dr. Hodge still differs with us strongly, and deals out unstintedly his condemnation of our course, and yet the general impression which these articles make upon our mind is, that his heart still pulsates with a brother's

---

It can hear no voice but his; obey no commands but his; pursue no ends but his. Its officers are his servants, bound to execute only his will. Its doctrines are his teachings, which he, as a prophet, has given from God; its discipline his law, which he, as king, has ordained. The power of the Church, accordingly, is only ministerial, and declarative. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is her rule of faith and practice. She can announce what it teaches; enjoin what it commands; prohibit what it condemns, and enforce her testimonies by spiritual sanctions. Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and to the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal; and when they are silent, it is her duty to put her hand upon her lips."

We add to the above, another statement of this "new theory," taken from a report presented to his Synod in 1861, ten years after the foregoing.

"This Synod is clear that the provinces of Church and State are entirely distinct, and that the Church as much transcends its sphere in pronouncing upon questions political, as the State transcends its sphere in dealing with matters ecclesiastical. The Church, it is true, is to declare and enforce revealed truth, and, among other duties, she is to enjoin obedience to the powers that be. But when the question arises, who and what those powers are, and how far obedience must be carried, the Church must remit the answer to the civil tribunals of the land, and to the dictates of the individual conscience. She has no commission from her Lord to declare what form of government any people shall adopt, how long they shall continue to maintain it, or under what circumstances they shall change it. Her members, as citizens, may and should take an active part in all discussions of the kind; but her courts, as authoritative tribunals of Christ, must be as silent as their Master. General principles she may, and must announce, the eternal principles of the moral law; but their concrete application to political constitutions and political changes, does not fall within the limits of her power."

love. We can truly say that we reciprocate his kind feelings, whilst we cannot shut our eyes to many things in these articles which we consider inconsistent and erroneous.

In drawing to a close, we shall be pardoned for making two short digressions from our main topic. Dr. Hodge tells us, p. 639, that as long ago as 1836, and in the years subsequent, he expressed the opinion that sudden and general emancipation would be disastrous to the blacks as well as to the whites. On p. 657, he tells us that as slavery was the cause of "the rebellion," and the South constantly refused reasonable terms, the President was right in emancipating all slaves within military lines, and the government right in demanding the entire and final abolition of slavery. This seems to us to signify that he accepts a fatal disaster for the blacks, in order to secure the punishment of the "rebellious" whites. And yet, if we mistake not, the chief ground of the eulogy of President Lincoln, published by Dr. Hodge, in his Review for July, (after having been delivered, as we understand, from several Presbyterian pulpits by him,) was the unspeakable boon to humanity of which he was the author in this very deed. As for ourselves, we retain all our former opinions respecting slavery. It was a kindly relation on both sides. It was a good institution, although some abuses were connected with it which demanded reformation, and would have been reformed had the South been let alone of her persecutors. But, whatever be our judgment of slavery, and whatever we may think of emancipation, we accept the latter as a fact accomplished. Slavery was an anxious trust to Southern Christians. Most conscientiously we studied its duties, and most earnestly we sought to solve the problem of its future. It occupied ourselves personally as no other question did for thirty years and more. Our Northern brethren claim a commission from the Almighty to solve the great problem, and they accordingly have abolished the institution. We cannot dispute their claim, nor are we so disposed. They have taken upon them a responsibility which, in some important respects, rids us of ours. The freedman is robbed of his old confidences and affections. His "best friends" now are strangers from a distance, who seek, at

least many of them, to set him against those he once confided in. Alas for him, neither for this world, nor for that which is to come, can his former master be, for the present, of much service to the freedman. It is a great work the North has assumed to do. Let them gird themselves for the mighty task, for to God must they answer it, if they fail in its accomplishment. In all sincerity we can and do pray that, in all they undertake for him which is for his real good, they may succeed and not fail. We believe this to be the sentiment of the Christian South. We still love the negro. He had powerful claims upon us before the war; his conduct all through that struggle, and even up to the present time, notwithstanding the many temptations to which he has been, and still is exposed, has added greatly to their force.

In like manner, we accept the failure of secession, as manifestly providential. The overthrow of that just cause made evident not so much the prowess of its foes, nor even their prodigiously superior resources, as it did the direct hand of the Almighty. Yes! the hand of God, gracious though heavy, is upon the South for her discipline. Dr. Hodge says, in his article on President Lincoln, p. 455, that the South is "humbled in her own eyes." Well, if the South were but humbled under God's mighty hand, in the true sense of the expression, we might well thank the Lord for his grace so given. And well may the North tremble, if all that has occurred has taught her only pride and self-confidence, censoriousness and severity towards brethren. But whatever may be true on this subject, it is not true that the South is ashamed of the war, or penitent for her noble, though unavailing, defence of constitutional liberty.

We close this article by reiterating our cordial acceptance of what Dr. Hodge says respecting the reunion of the Churches upon the pages indicated above. Schism being a sinful thing, we are bound to desire ecclesiastical reconstruction, if it can be consistently and properly acquired. We re-echo, with deep solemnity of feeling, Dr. Hodge's words, "If reunion be prevented merely by alienation of feeling, it will be a poor excuse in the day of judgment to have refused fellowship with Chris-

tian brethren, because of hatred towards them." In all sincerity we aver that this is not our case. We were forced to part from our brethren by their forsaking the old and right way of keeping the Church separate from the State, and we are obliged to continue apart, because more and more this grievous error has been developed amongst them. But we do not hate them. Their errors are hateful to us, but not their persons. Besides this difficulty in the way of reunion, there are some others. One is their attitude on the subject of slavery—a rationalistic and practically infidel attitude,—for they have set up a morality better than the Bible's, and are impugning the perfectness of Christ's conduct and doctrine. They claim to be more righteous than God, and wiser than his word. Still another is the relation they persist in maintaining between the Church and other organisations appointed to act in her stead. They seem wedded to a denial of the Church's right and duty to do, herself, her own Master's work. God's good providence has delivered our Church from this thraldom. We should sin, were we not to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Upon all these three important matters we seem to be called, as a Church, to give a testimony. We must stand in our lot, and bear witness to the truth, as it has been committed to us.